

**2003-2007 OREGON STATEWIDE COMPREHENSIVE
OUTDOOR RECREATION PLAN**

JANUARY 2003

**CHAPTER SEVEN
A GUIDE TO OREGON COMMUNITY
PARK AND RECREATION
PLANNING**



Nature
HISTORY
Discovery

Prepared by the
Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This SCORP chapter is a modified version of the original publication *A Guide to Community Park and Recreation Planning for Illinois Communities*, Second Edition, March 2001, developed by the Illinois Department of Natural Resources. The State of Oregon and the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department gratefully acknowledges the Illinois Department of Natural Resources' permission to use their publication.

CHAPTER SEVEN

A GUIDE TO COMMUNITY PARK AND RECREATION PLANNING

During the July 31, 2001 SCORP Advisory Committee Meeting, committee members clearly stated that evidence of sound park and recreation planning should be a critical factor to consider in evaluating requests for Land and Water Conservation Funding. They were also aware that small communities in the state are struggling with the question of how to conduct long-term recreation planning. They felt that it would not be fair to simply ask all recreation providers across the state to "do it." The committee's recommendation was to use the SCORP plan as a vehicle for providing local agency staff or planning teams with all the guidance necessary to develop a quality park and recreation plan for their jurisdiction.

To satisfy this request, OPRD staff developed the following chapter to assist local units of government in Oregon (cities, counties, special districts, ports and regional districts) in preparing a park and recreation plan for their jurisdiction. The guide is designed to be easily followed by local agency staff and/or a designated group, such as an appointed planning team, which has the responsibility for preparing a recreation plan. Although reference is made throughout this guide to a community plan, the planning process described can apply to any agency-wide park and recreation plan of a unit of local government



INTRODUCTION

Evidence of sound park and recreation planning is a critical factor considered by the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department (OPRD) in evaluating requests for the grant funding available annually to units of local government for the acquisition of public open space and development of recreation facilities. OPRD believes park and recreation planning encourages:

- provision of recreational opportunities in an effective and efficient manner,
- conservation of open space and natural and cultural resources,
- community quality of life,
- environmental education,
- sensible community growth, and
- economic development, especially recreation-related tourism.

Regional planning commissions or local planning departments, planning consultants, faculty at local educational institutions and others may be able to help you develop a plan. This guide is not intended to replace professional planning expertise that may be obtained by your community. The information and material in this guide can either supplement such assistance or provide enough guidance to enable a local agency to develop a basic park and recreation plan where such expertise is not available.



THE PLANNING PROCESS

Why should you plan? First, understand that everyone plans. In our personal life, we plan our day's activities, the itinerary for a trip, and how to complete work assignments on time. Some of our plans are longer range such as those for sending our children to college and ensuring financial security for our retirement. **Having a plan does not ensure success, but neglecting to plan often leads to failure.** It has been said that, "Failing to plan is planning to fail."

In organizations and agencies of government the need for planning is even more important because:

- Success usually depends on the efforts of a number of individuals, working together to meet the needs of many other people, including those within the organization.
- Defining success is often complex.
- Plans usually must be longer range.
- Public bodies, answerable to voters, have special responsibilities, for example, for the wise use of public funds and to fulfill legal mandates.
- The public must be provided opportunities for input in the planning process and expressing their opinions.

For these reasons, **it is critical that all members of an agency:**

- (1) **are working toward the same outcomes, and**
- (2) **agree on how to pursue these outcomes.**

If an agency has not agreed on where it is going, its members are likely to find themselves working toward different goals. Even if all agree on what the agency's goals are, without agreement on how to achieve these goals, staff will again find themselves working at cross-purposes.

Developing a park and recreation plan does not have to be complicated and costly. The planning process presented is basically a common sense approach for identifying and deciding how to meet the recreation and open space needs of your community.

Planning involves:

- **looking at where a community stands today,**

- **envisioning where it wants to be tomorrow, and**
- **determining how to best move from today's situation to the desired future.**

THERE ARE PLANS, AND THEN THERE ARE PLANS.

There are many types of plans: comprehensive, strategic, master, site, etc. Unfortunately these labels are sometimes used inconsistently, and plans are sometimes mislabeled. In many cases, plans combine aspects of more than one type of planning.

Using the planning process in this guide will result in what is usually called a community master plan for parks and recreation that combines aspects of both strategic and comprehensive planning methods.

A park and recreation master plan provides an overall framework to guide the provision of park and recreation services in a community. It should be consistent with the general plan of the community. The general plan is a multi-purpose community plan containing interrelated policies and actions for all major community governmental functions and responsibilities such as transportation, land use and education.

Comprehensive planning usually describes an approach to planning that is inclusive and considers, quantitatively if possible, all known factors, as well as the interrelationships among these factors, that might influence the function(s) for which the plan is developed. The resulting plans are usually long-range and general.

Strategic planning emphasizes developing a vision of a future condition the planning jurisdiction wants to achieve and determining specifically what strategies will be used to achieve this envisioned future. Strategic plans tend to be less quantitative, more focused and action-oriented and have shorter time horizons.

Fortunately, these distinctions are not critical to developing your plan. This guide refers simply to "a park and recreation plan" to avoid confusion.

GETTING STARTED

When the decision has been made to develop a park and recreation plan, the following initial tasks need to be accomplished:

1. **The local city council or park board should adopt a formal resolution calling for and supporting the planning process** (See Form 1). The resolution will demonstrate to the community that the governing body is committed to the park and recreation planning effort and that it accepts its role in future plan implementation.
2. **A park and recreation planning team, including at least one member from the governing body, should be officially appointed to develop the plan.** The planning team will collect and analyze information, involve the public in the planning process, develop the major elements of the plan itself and present the plan to the public for review and the governing body for consideration and official adoption.

The planning team should include members from those community organizations and interests that will be most affected by the plan's recommendations and whose support will be necessary to implement the plan. Team members must have the time, commitment and ability to stay with the planning process from start to finish. They should be familiar with the community and its parks and recreation system and represent a cross-section of the community: business, civic and educational leaders as well as members of the general public. Residents that have a personal interest in local park and recreation opportunities, such as those with young children or children active in sports, members of the disabled community and seniors are often well suited for this responsibility.

In order to maintain the planning team at a workable size of about 15 members, it will be necessary to distinguish between those community interests who will be represented on the team and those whose input can be gained through the public participation

process. Community members who have special expertise in planning, natural resources management or other areas relevant to plan development can be asked to participate as non-voting advisors to the team.


3. **A brief description of the role and responsibilities of the planning team, i.e., a "job description" for planning team members should be prepared.** For example, clarify that the team will recommend a plan to the governing body, not adopt the plan themselves. Specify the level of commitment expected of team members so that those invited will be able to determine if they are able and willing to participate fully. (How the team members will interact with each other to carry out their business usually can be left for the team themselves to determine at their first meeting. See Step 1.)



4. **Background material, which will be useful to planning team members in developing a common base of community knowledge relevant to the plan, should be assembled.** For example, this material might include:

- Descriptions of the community's present park and recreation areas, facilities and staff, as well as the current park and recreation budget.
- Information on the community, its residents and population trends.
- Organizational chart that displays the governmental structure of your community and clarifies where the responsibility for parks and recreation lies in relationship to other government functions (see sample chart below).

Figure 7.1. Sample Municipal Organizational Structure



- Existing community park and recreation plans and statements of community park and recreation mission and goals.
- Park and recreation plans from communities like yours.
- This planning guide.

Be selective and present information as concisely as possible, perhaps annotating it and supplementing it with briefings at initial team meetings and as needed.

With the planning team formed, legitimized by ordinance and briefed, the team is now ready to begin meeting and preparing the park and recreation plan. The following material provides a step-by-step process that can be used as described or adapted to develop the plan.

STEPS IN PREPARING A COMMUNITY PARK AND RECREATION PLAN

Step 1: Organize the Planning Team.

The planning team's first task is to organize itself. The team needs to:

1. **Select a Chairperson (unless the governing body wishes to assign this responsibility) to conduct team meetings and direct team activities.** This election may be left for a later meeting if team members do not yet know each other with someone designated to serve as interim chairperson.

It may also be desirable to obtain the help of a person with experience in conducting group problem-solving meetings to serve as a non-voting team facilitator. A facilitator can neutrally guide discussion, allowing the chairperson to participate more in the substance of team discussions.

2. **Select someone to take notes, keep a record of group decisions, and prepare and disseminate team products.** If the team has a facilitator, this is often part of their responsibilities. Otherwise a team member may be willing to do this, or the convening body or a team member may be able to supply a member of their staff for this purpose.

However the team decides to divide, distribute and carry out their responsibilities, the team must recognize that certain needs for effective and efficient team functioning exist and must be met.

3. **Agree on "ground rules"** to enable the team to interact in a productive, non-confrontational manner. Some ground rules are obvious, such as no side conversations, only one person talks at a time and only when recognized by the facilitator or chair. Other rules may be more difficult to decide on, such as whether a member can send a substitute when they can not attend a meeting and whether the team will make decisions by consensus or majority vote.

One rule that most well-functioning working teams adopt is that **members may vigorously criticize ideas, but not other team members personally.** It is just as easy, and definitely more conducive to team functioning, to say, "I disagree with that suggestion," than to state, "That's the dumbest idea I've heard today." Getting personal is unnecessary and can quickly disrupt a team.

Letting the team set its own rules encourages members to follow them.

Step 2: Agree on a Planning Process and Schedule.

1. **Agree on a planning process,** either the one described in this guide, some adaptation of it, or some other process the team is confident will effectively produce the type of plan they need. As part of the planning process, consider where in the process public input will occur and what type of input is needed at these points (See Step 3).
2. **Agree on a time schedule for the plan** based on the planning process. Identify any external dates (e.g., grant application deadlines) that may affect the schedule. Consideration of the schedule may prompt revisions in the planning process until some balance is reached between the type of planning process used and the time and effort required from team members for plan completion.



A chart such as the one below helps display the schedule.

Figure 7.2. Sample Community Park and Recreation Plan Schedule



It is important to understand that the planning process may be lengthy, taking six months to a year. The time needed will vary among communities, and a realistic time schedule should be established early in the process. How fast you can proceed will depend upon the level of commitment of those participating in the planning and how well they are able to balance the demands of the planning process with their other responsibilities. **Important challenges that need to be considered and met include (1) stimulating and maintaining participant interest and (2) making participation as easy and efficient as possible.**

Step 3: Develop a Public Participation Strategy.

To improve the quality of the plan and to ensure its widest acceptance, it is important that local citizens have the opportunity to participate in the planning process and that citizen input is responded to and incorporated into the plan. Some **key points to consider** regarding public participation in the planning process include:

- The members of the planning team may write an excellent community park and recreation plan. However, **in order for the plan to be implemented, it must be supported by the community and especially the community's leaders and elected officials.** Consider arranging special meetings to obtain input from key civic groups and individuals, either collectively or in individual interviews. Forms 2 and 3 provide examples of questionnaires that can be used for interviews with community leaders and park district commissioners or other elected officials responsible for parks and recreation services.
- The support necessary for implementation will not occur unless citizens believe that they have had a real opportunity to make their needs and desires known and that the **planning team took the public input seriously in developing the plan.** Form 4 is an example of a questionnaire that can be used in conjunction with a public meeting.

- The public participation strategy provides an opportunity to inform and involve residents in their community's parks and recreation services now and as they could be in the future. **An aggressive and effective public participation strategy can mobilize active community support for the plan and its implementation.** This can be the most beneficial part of the entire planning process.
- Use media coverage (newspaper, radio, and television) to broaden interest in the plan.
- Involve the park and recreation agency's own employees.
- Different methods of obtaining public input may be more useful for some purposes than others at certain points in the planning process. Different methods may reach different segments of the community. For example, consider:
 - Surveys conducted by mail, telephone or newspaper to collect broad citizen input.
 - Workshops to generate ideas.
 - Personal interviews with key community members and/or elected officials.
 - Structured small groups to resolve conflict.
 - Public meetings to obtain community input and accept comments on drafts of the plan.
- Everyone must be given the opportunity to say whatever he or she wants. However, asking the public to respond to specific questions can often result in more useful input.
- Be open to criticism as well as praise.

The strategy used to obtain public review and input should be fully described in the plan, usually in an appendix. The following information should be included:

1. A description of the strategy and the specific methods used to obtain public input (e.g., public meetings, questionnaire, phone survey) with samples of the forms or questionnaires used.
2. The number of persons that provided input (e.g., the number surveyed and the number

who responded, the number invited to and the number in attendance and speaking at meetings).

3. The dates and locations of meetings and/or surveys.
4. A summary of the input received.
5. The planning team's analysis and evaluation of the content of the input and how the input was responded to (e.g., how the plan was changed to reflect input, suggestions not taken with the reason given).

Step 4: Collect and Display Basic Information.

Local, county or state agencies or planning departments and commissions for your jurisdiction may have already collected some of the basic information you need.

1. Inventory Existing Recreation Sites and Facilities.

A logical starting point for planning is to determine what recreation sites and facilities are now available to community residents. Using a separate Form 5, or a similar form, **for each park and recreation site within the community, inventory the types and amount of facilities and activities provided at the site.** The inventory should also include schools, church properties, and civic and private recreation areas available to the public, as well as those parks that may be outside the community but are commonly used by your residents.

Take the park and recreation facility information gathered on the individual Form 5's for each **public** sites and compile it using Form 6. Then do the same thing for all the **private** sites inventoried using another copy of Form 6. Then total the public and private inventory for a **total community inventory** of available recreation sites and parks. (Use columns 1 and 2 of Form 6 for the public and private sites' totals and the Total column for the community totals.) These tables provide convenient overall summaries of existing park and recreation resources in your community.

An evaluation of the accessibility of existing parks and recreation facilities to the disabled is an important and necessary part of the site and community inventories. All communities are required by federal and state law to address accessibility considerations for sites and facilities within their jurisdiction and to include individuals with disabilities in their self-evaluation assessment (See Addendum 1). At a minimum, sites should be evaluated using the basic accessibility concepts outlined on Form 7, Accessibility Checklist.

2. Collect Resource Information.

As a part of the Statewide Land Use Planning Program, Oregon's 240 cities and 36 counties are responsible for adopting local comprehensive plans. Important natural and cultural resource information from your local comprehensive plan (e.g., streams and their corridors, forests, wildlife habitat, wetlands and historic and archeological sites) should be identified.

Knowledge of these resources helps identify natural and historic settings that may be potential sites for community parks. It is also important information needed to prevent the unnecessary and perhaps illegal damage of important resources protected by law when developing recreation facilities.

Some of these identified resources may be unique to the community, region or even the state. If so, consider protecting these resources as a public park with public access provided in a manner compatible with protecting and enhancing the resources. Examples include a wetland with walking paths and a viewing stand for wildlife observation and a historic home restored to provide offices for park staff and to house a museum of community history. **By incorporating protection of a community's special resources and places in its mission, a local park and recreation agency can gain broader community support for its overall mission, while helping preserve those assets that make the community unique.**

Note: After completion of this park and recreation planning effort, it may be necessary to amend the recreation component of your current local comprehensive plan. Recommendations from this recreational planning process should be compatible with those included in your local comprehensive plan.

3. Display Important Information on Maps.

To assist in planning, a good map of your community (jurisdiction) showing the location of existing and planned parks and other important features, including natural and cultural resources should be developed (See Addendum 2). A legible street/road map can be used for the base. Communities that do not have a good quality street map, may obtain such maps from the Oregon Department of Transportation's Geographic Information Services Unit¹. Maps are currently available (in pdf and Bentley Microstation files) for 240 Oregon cities on the ODOT's website at <http://www.odot.state.or.us/tmappingpublic/city2.htm>.

4. Collect Population Information.

Use Form 8 to collect basic socio-economic and population information for your community. Evaluation of census information from 1970 through 2000, as well as any additional information on recent developments that may affect population trends, will enable the planning team to forecast possible future population trends and estimate future recreation needs. For your convenience, Oregon Census Data for counties and communities is included in Addendum 8.

¹ For more information contact the Oregon Department of Transportation's Geographic Information Services Unit at 555 13th. Street N.E., Suite 2, Salem, Oregon 97301-4178. Telephone: 503.986.4245.

5. Consider Any Existing Community Plans.

The planning process should include a review of all existing park and recreation plans, as well as other adopted community plans, for example, community general plans and plans for other government functions such as transportation, which might affect the provision of park and recreation services.

Step 5: Identify Needs and Issues.

1. Needs

One of the more challenging aspects of park and recreation planning is determining how much open space or parkland and the types and quantities of recreation facilities a community needs. OPRD has collected information on the average number of recreation facilities that exist in Oregon for each thousand residents (See Addendum 3). The Department has also collected information on how often Oregon residents participate in various types of outdoor recreation activities (See Addendum 4).

The supply information that was collected in Step 4 can be used to **calculate the current number of community recreation facilities for each thousand residents in your community.** Using projected population in ten years rather than existing population may provide more useful averages for planning purposes, especially for growing communities.

The per capita supply calculated for your community can then be compared to the statewide figures in Addendum 3. Deficits, especially when they occur for facilities that provide opportunities for popular activities with high participation rates (as indicated in Addendum 4) may indicate community needs.

For example, this analysis may disclose that a community, call it Pleasant Town, which expects to grow from 3,000 to 3,500 residents in the next ten years, has:

- No outdoor swimming pool.
- One softball and baseball field (about half of the statewide average for

communities of Pleasant Town's size).

- Eight hundred acres of equipped playground (below the statewide average).

Of course, communities vary in their outdoor recreation interests and population trends. Experience with your community and how its residents differ from those of other communities in Oregon will help you make informed decisions about needs suggested by this type of analysis. However, be aware that **research indicates that community recreation interests may reflect to a large extent what facilities are currently available to residents. That is, if facilities exist for some types of recreation, but not for other types, residents may express wishes for even more facilities of the type already present simply because they have not had the opportunity to experience the other, unsupplied or under-supplied types of recreation.**

2. Issues

Recreation planners have found it useful to supplement numerically based types of need information with information collected more directly from the community's residents. This type of information can be obtained through the public input strategy discussed in Step 3 above. It may consist of the results of a survey of the public and/or community leaders and statements made at a public meeting about what residents want and think their community needs.

The results of such input usually do not lend themselves to numerical analysis beyond counting and averaging, but may provide important information. "Needs" identified in this manner are often referred to as issues. These issues include concerns and potential opportunities and challenges to which residents believe the community should respond.

Issues are usually simply recorded. For example, for Pleasant Town, some issues identified were:

- Save the Historic Jones Farmstead and grounds.
- We need organized softball leagues.
- Clean up the riverbank downtown and use it for recreation.
- Develop a bicycle and jogging trail.
- More programs for teenagers are needed.

Other issues or concerns may derive from the planning team's analysis of community facilities and resources. For example, Pleasant Town's planning team discovered that:

- Facilities in City Park are run down and not usable by disabled residents.
- The abandoned railroad through town intersects a trail being constructed by OPRD three miles from town.
- There were complaints that teens were rollerblading in areas not constructed for this purpose.

Step 6: Focus on the Highest Priority Needs and Issues.

The planning team should use the information provided by: (1) comparing supply and participation information to identify needs and (2) issues identified through public participation and other means to identify the most important community park and recreation needs and issues.

The planning team should then focus the plan on addressing this limited number (often less than ten, rarely more than twenty) of the highest priority items. The planning team has to exercise its judgment in extracting what it believes are the most important community needs and issues from the information it has collected. Focusing the plan this way will also help efforts to implement the plan.

The needs and issues selected will probably not fully satisfy everyone in the community or even all members of the planning team. However, there

should be enough scope and diversity in the items chosen that most residents will find something in the plan that is important to them and stimulates them to support the plan.

These needs/issues might include:

- More open space
- More opportunities for a particular type of recreation
- More accessible facilities better distributed throughout the community
- Protection of special community resources
- Rehabilitation of existing areas and facilities
- New and expanded recreation programs

A relatively simple policy change or administrative action may address some items. Other items, probably most, will be more difficult to address and may require funding not yet in place. The planning team might decide that some items are not immediately addressable for reasons such as lack of authority or funds. However, **if an issue is important to the public, the planning team should hesitate before excluding it.** It may be more advisable to include the issue in the planning process in the hope that some practical way of at least beginning to address it may be identified. Conditions change and it is always prudent to lay some groundwork for the future. New opportunities might arise later to more fully address important but difficult issues or needs.

A method the planning team can use to select the most important needs and issues for the plan is described in Addendum 5.

Step 7: Develop a Vision.

By this step in the planning process, the planning team will have collected and evaluated much information about the community and its parks and recreation services. Citizens of the community will have been heard from. The team will have analyzed, thought about and discussed this input in identifying the most important planning issues.

Now is the time for the planning team to develop a vision of the kind of parks and recreation services their community should have in ten years (or whatever period is chosen for the plan). **The vision should excite and inspire the community's**

residents. However, the planning team should try to achieve a balance between a vision that is ambitious and exciting and one that is realistic and achievable. Attaining the vision may require hard work and commitment from the community and its leaders, but it must not be seen as unreasonable and unattainable or the vision and the plan to achieve it will be rejected.

The statement of the vision should focus on the highest priority parks and recreation needs and concerns of the community. Where does the planning team envision the community will stand with respect to these concerns in ten years? What will be the effect on the community and its residents? What will your community look like to its residents and visitors? Describe a future that community members will be able to visualize. A sample vision statement is given in Addendum 6.

The members of the planning team and the community must share the vision. Asking for public comment on the vision statement to determine whether it accurately reflects the aspirations of the community is recommended at this point.

Step 8: Formulate Goals and Objectives.

1. Goals

Goals embody the outcomes that will need to occur in order for the community to achieve its vision. Goals are written as broad statements of long-range aspirations that set overall direction for the community.

Goals may be stated in general, broad-brush terms that identify what the community should be or what the community should look like. However, goals should be measurable at least in principle. For example, "To make Pleasant Town a better place to live" is too general. "To provide Pleasant Town's residents with increased and improved opportunities for popular recreation opportunities" is more specific, measurable in principle and thus preferred. Most plans focus on ten or fewer broad goals.

Other goal statements for Pleasant Town might include:

- To provide more open space for recreation purposes.
- To rehabilitate existing recreation facilities and make them accessible to all residents.
- To provide close-to-home playgrounds for all children in the community.
- To provide recreation programs for all segments of the community.

The plan's goals should be linked to the community's highest priority needs and issues and the elements of your vision statement. Goals can be generated by asking, "What will have to be achieved in order to realize (the elements of) the vision statement and address the community's highest priority needs and issues?"

2. Objectives

Objectives are statements of outcomes that must be accomplished to enable the community to fully achieve a goal. **Objectives are more specific than goals and must be actually measurable.** Usually each broad goal will have more than one objective. It may be necessary to limit the number of objectives for each goal. Identifying only the most important ones helps the plan retain its focus.

For example, in order for Pleasant Town to achieve the first goal above, "To provide more open space for recreation purposes," several objectives might need to be met, including:

- Acquire and develop a new community park.
- Develop two new playgrounds.

The planning team may decide to accelerate this phase of plan development by dividing the work yet to be done. Sub teams of the planning team can be formed with each responsible for one or two goals. The sub teams can formulate objectives (and later strategies and actions) for review by the entire planning team.

The process described in Addendum 5 can be used again, here to generate objectives for each goal.

Step 9: Identify Strategies.

When the objectives for each goal have been identified, the planning team will have identified what must occur for the vision to be realized. Now the team must focus on how each objective will be accomplished. That is, what strategy or strategies should be used to accomplish each objective?

Strategies should be:

- narrowly focused,
- quantifiable,
- do-able, and
- targeted to a timeframe.

The strategies may be both short and long-term. They may be relatively easy to accomplish or require much effort. For the objective, "Acquire and develop a new community park" some examples of strategies might include:

- Identify and assess potential sites for a new community park.
- Analyze potential funding sources for the new park.

Step 10: Prioritize Strategies and Develop an Action Program.

Since each goal can have more than one objective and each objective more than one strategy, strategies can multiply. For example, a plan with eight goals, each with four objectives, each of which has three strategies will have $8 \times 4 \times 3 = 96$ total strategies. Even if the planning team places limits on the number of objectives per goal and the number of strategies per objective, a large number of strategies can result. The resulting plan may be discouraging in its long list of things that need to be done.

The What and How of Planning

One of the challenges that face any planning team is distinguishing between the "building blocks" of a plan: goals, objectives, strategies and actions. Sometimes in practice the distinctions among these are fine, perhaps even insignificant in the larger scheme of the plan. The most important thing is that you first decide on **WHAT YOU ARE TRYING TO ACHIEVE** (vision, goals and objectives) and then determine **HOW YOU PROPOSE TO ACHIEVE THESE THINGS** (strategies and actions).

The process described in this guide is designed to systematically step down from a more general vision statement to more specific statements of **what** needs to be accomplished (goals and objectives). Then identifying **how** these objectives will be achieved is done by similarly stepping down from more general strategies to very specific actions.

The essential elements of any plan are the two end points of the process: the **vision** of **what** you want to occur in the future and the specific **actions** that describe **how** the vision will be achieved. If the intermediate steps and terminology confuse the planning team, instead of making it easier to move from vision to actions, consider omitting one or more of the steps.

In the extreme, if the elements of your vision are clearly laid out in specific terms in the vision statement, the planning team may be able to proceed directly from the vision to generating specific actions to achieve the vision. However, the reasoning behind actions that the full planning process makes more systematic and explicit may be lost, and the plan may become more difficult to develop and less understandable to its readers. This can be addressed to some extent by providing brief narrative paragraphs for each goal or element of the vision statement that explain the planning team's approach to the item and rationale for actions.

Remember this planning process is just one way to plan that can be adapted as necessary to better fit your situation.

When the plan results in more things to do than can be realistically accomplished within a single, relatively short time frame, the planning team should prioritize. Choose a limited number of strategies, perhaps ten, and develop an action program that specifies exactly what actions are expected to occur in the first year or two of implementation, i.e., who is expected to do what by when.

The planning team should consider choosing strategies for the action program that:

- **Can begin to be implemented at once** and whose accomplishment will substantially help achieve important objectives.
- **Allow results to be seen by the public in the first year of plan implementation.**
- Allow progress to be made toward each of the plan's goals.
- Provide benefits to as many segments of the community as possible.
- Generate excitement, enthusiasm and involvement in the community's park and recreation future.
- Involve both acquisition and development of land for parks, as well as renovation of existing facilities.
- Contain actions that can both be carried out with existing funding and depend on generating new funds.
- Address high priority organizational needs (e.g., staff and funding) in a way that will not be seen as self serving.

Make sure that each action is stated in specific enough terms that it will be clear when it is accomplished. Avoid actions that call for "more of" something. Specify "how much more" or "how many." Be specific about who is responsible for leading the activities to accomplish this action item. An action may require the contributions of several or even many, persons or organizations to complete. However, **in order to establish accountability, some specific person or entity should be held responsible for carrying out the action.**

Establish reasonable but specific deadlines. Questions relating to responsibility and time frames for actions are often negotiated with those primarily responsible for implementation during

the final drafting of the plan. For example, actions related to Pleasant Town's new park might include:

- **The city will identify potential park sites in Pleasant Town by September 1, 200-.**
- **The Pleasant Town City Council will appoint a New Park Task Force by May 1, 200-.**
- **The Task Force will first identify potential funding sources and develop alternative funding strategies for acquisition and development of the new park. The Task Force will consider grant programs, community fund-raising, facility sponsorship and imposing an open space impact fee for new development.**

Some communities find it most useful to prepare an annual action program, coordinated with the community's budget cycle. Annual action program development can also be coordinated with assessing progress in plan implementation, as well as reexamining the plan in view of changing conditions.

How items will be funded will be an important consideration in implementing the plan and the action programs developed from it. In preparing an action program, the cost of actions should be estimated and potential funding sources recommended.

The Oregon Parks and Recreation Department urges you to familiarize yourself with the grant programs it administers described in Addendum 7. Participation in these programs has significantly helped Oregon communities implement their plans and realize their visions for the park and recreation future of their communities.

Note: Addendum 7 also includes information about Oregon Marine Board administered grant programs and other potential funding sources.

Length is Not Necessarily Strength

As the planning team writes the plan, it is important to keep in mind that the plan is intended to be a persuasive document. Prepare a plan that when read will interest, and hopefully excite the reader to support it and work for the plan's implementation.

If the plan is long, unattractive or otherwise difficult to read, the plan's intentions for readership, let alone persuasion and implementation, will not be realized.

Therefore, keep your plan as brief and focused as possible. Place less important and the more detailed material in appendices, or if lengthy, in a companion publication. Always keep in mind who your primary audience is and write for them. Remember the most important readers to persuade may also be the busiest.

Make the plan look so interesting that people want to pick it up and read it. Make it as easy as possible for them to read the plan and focus on its most important aspects. Prepare a short executive summary of the plan if necessary. If help in preparing an attractive publication through utilizing a professional for layout and graphics is available, use it.

If the results of implementing the plan are visible to the public, especially where they constitute actual improvements in recreation opportunity for residents, momentum for implementation will increase. If little appears to be occurring after the plan is completed, the plan soon will begin to lose credibility and support.

An excellent way to begin implementation is to submit an application to OPRD for grant assistance from one or more of the programs described in Addendum 7 to help fund an action (or actions) in the plan's action program.

3. Plan Updating

Communities and their park and recreation needs and issues change. As a consequence, park and recreation plans should be evaluated and updated at least every five years. The initial plan can itself acknowledge the need for updating and even recommend a mechanism for the updating to occur. One possible mechanism, discussed in Step 10, is to coordinate reexamination and updating of the plan with annual action program development.

Many park and recreation agencies elicit feedback from their park users, as well as non-users, on a regular basis to identify service issues and emerging needs that should be addressed in plan updating.

FOLLOW-UP

1. Resolution to Adopt the Plan

When the plan is completed, it should be presented to the governing council or board for formal approval (See Form 9). Upon approval, the plan becomes the official park and recreation plan of the community. Approval indicates to OPRD and other potential funding agencies that the community's elected officials are committed to the plan and its implementation.

2. Plan Implementation

The momentum for plan implementation will be greatest immediately after the plan's completion and official approval. Therefore, it is important that the plan's initial action program be immediately prepared and vigorously pursued.

SOURCES OF PLANNING INFORMATION AND ASSISTANCE

As indicated previously, much of the information needed to develop a community park and recreation plan may have already been collected by other local, county, regional and state agencies. Some of these agencies and organizations may also be willing to supply technical assistance in planning, data collection and analysis, meeting facilitation, plan publication and various aspects of the plan. In some cases, it may be helpful to make representatives of agencies who have these capabilities members of or advisors to your planning team.

In addition to those sources already mentioned in the text, potential sources of planning information include:

- Regional Planning Commissions
- County and Municipal Planning Departments
- Planning consultants
- United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Conservation Service
- Oregon Recreation & Parks Association
Website: <http://www.orpa.org/>
- Oregon Parks Association
- Special Districts Association of Oregon
- Park and recreation agencies of neighboring communities
- Oregon Tourism Commission
Website: <http://www.traveloregon.com/>
- Local Colleges and Universities
- Center for Population Research and Census – Portland State University
Website: <http://www.upa.pdx.edu/CPRC/>
Phone: 503.725.3922
- U.S. Census Bureau
Website: <http://www.census.gov/>

CHECKLIST FOR THE PLANNING PROCESS

- Board or Council Resolution Supporting Planning Effort Passed
- Planning Team Appointed
- Description of Roles and Responsibilities of Planning Team Prepared
- Background Material for Planning Team Assembled
- Planning Team Organized
- Chairperson Selected
- Facilitator or Secretary Selected
- Ground Rules Agreed-on
- Planning Process Approved
- Time Schedule Approved
- Public Participation Strategy Developed
- Basic Information Collected
 - Existing Recreation Sites Inventoried
 - Natural and Cultural Resources Identified
- Community Map Prepared
- Existing Plans Reviewed
- Needs and Issues Identified
- Needs and Issues Prioritized
- Vision Statement Prepared
- Goals Stated
- Objectives Formulated
- Strategies Identified
- Action Plan Developed
- Board or Council Resolution Approving Plan Passed
- Plan Implementation Underway
- Strategy for Updating Plan Identified

FORM 1:
RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF PLANNING

The following sample resolution can be used by the appropriate elective body to support the community park and recreation planning effort.

WHEREAS, the _____ (Corporate Name)
recognizes the importance of parks and recreation to the quality of life of the residents of
_____, Oregon

WHEREAS, the need to provide quality park and recreation services for residents is
recognized, and

WHEREAS, the importance of sound planning in order to effectively meet the park and
recreation needs of its citizens is understood,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT
THE _____ supports the preparation of a Park and
Recreation Plan, to be used upon adoption by this body as its official plan for the next ___
years, to guide the provision of park and recreational services in our community.

Passed and signed this ___ day of _____, 20__.

ATTEST:

President / Mayor

Clerk / Secretary

FORM 2:
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR COMMUNITY LEADERS

1. Are you familiar with the programs and facilities offered by the park district?
2. Do you utilize park district programs and/or facilities?
3. Do existing programs and facilities meet the needs of all age groups?
4. Should existing programs be increased? If yes, identify.
5. Should new programs be added? If yes, can you explain?
6. How can the park district best serve the recreation needs of the residents within its boundaries?
7. Do you believe the park district wisely allocates your tax dollars?
8. Do you believe park district facilities are properly maintained?
9. Would district residents support an increase in taxes or fees for:
 - increased land acquisition
 - park improvements (e.g., new restrooms, boat ramp, floral display, bikeways, playground equipment, accessibility)
 - swimming pool renovation or replacement
 - new community center
10. What is the public's image of the district?
11. What are some long-range goals you recommend that the park district board consider?

Note: Communities without park districts should adapt this form to reflect their community's method of providing park and recreation services.

FORM 3:
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR PARK DISTRICT COMMISSIONERS

1. What are your long-range goals for the park district?
2. Should programs of the district be increased or expanded? If yes, identify.
3. Should new programs be developed? If yes, explain.
4. Is the district able to meet its current and projected financial obligations?
5. Do district residents believe their tax dollars are wisely utilized and allocated?
6. What are the highest priority capital improvements needed by the district? (pool, community center, sports complex, playground equipment, restrooms)
7. Should the district acquire more land? If yes, do you have suggested locations or areas for expansion?
8. Would district residents support increases in fees?
9. Would district residents support a tax increase for capital improvements?
10. Is the district maximizing its relationship with other governmental and private agencies (e.g., city, township, county, school district, college)?
11. What is the public's image of the district?
12. What are the greatest challenges facing the district in the next 5 to 10 years?

Note: Communities without park districts should adapt this form to reflect their community's method of providing park and recreation services.

FORM 4:

PUBLIC MEETING QUESTIONNAIRE

PLEASANT TOWN PARK DISTRICT

PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING

Thursday, December 9, 200-

7:00 p.m.- 9:00 p.m.

Questionnaire

Your input is important to this long-range planning process and to the future of your park district. We would appreciate your answering the following questions:

1. Are you familiar with programs and facilities offered by the park district? Yes__ No__
2. Do you use district programs and/or facilities? Yes__ No__
3. Do existing programs and facilities meet the needs of all age groups? Yes__ No__
4. Should existing programs be increased? If yes, identify. Yes__ No__
5. Should new programs be added? If yes, please explain. Yes__ No__
6. Do you believe the district facilities are properly maintained? Yes__ No__
7. Should the district acquire more parkland? Yes__ No__
8. Should the district make park improvements? If yes, identify:
 - new restrooms
 - new shelters
 - boat ramp
 - bikeways
 - playground equipment
 - increase accessibility for disabled
 - renovate/replace pool
 - new community center
 - other
9. What are some long-range goals that you recommend the park district board consider for the next 3 to 5 years?
10. What are the greatest challenges facing the park district in the next 3 to 5 years?

Name _____

Address _____

Thank you for your input. We will summarize the information we receive from all returned questionnaires.

Note: Communities without park districts should adapt this form to reflect their community's method of providing park and recreation services.

**FORM 5:
SITE INVENTORY**

Park / Site Name _____ Type ____ Acreage ____ Managing Agency _____

Recreation Facility	Amount	Condition / Accessibility	Comments
Basketball-outdoor courts			
Boat & canoe access			
Fishing access			
Golf course			
In-line skating			
Play Equipment			
Soccer fields			
Softball / Baseball fields			
Swimming beaches			
Swimming pools			
Tennis courts			
Trails			
Volleyball courts			
Wildlife observation			
Other:			
Amenities			
Benches			
Community center / Indoor facilities			
Grills			
Picnic tables			
Restrooms			
Shelters			
Water fountains			
Other:			
Special Features			
Archaeological sites			
Historical sites & structures			
Lakes or ponds			
Prairie remnants			
Rivers or streams			
Wetlands			
Woodlots / Forests			
Other:			

Note: For **Type** of Site or Park, use the following code:

N=Neighborhood park (serves part of community; usually within a 1/2 mile radius)

C=Community park (serves entire community)

O=Other

For **Amount**, use an appropriate measure (e.g., number of, miles of, number of holes)

FORM 6:

COMMUNITY INVENTORY

Site / Park	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Name						
Type						
Acreage						
Recreation Facilities						
Basketball-outdoor courts						
Boat & canoe access						
Fishing access						
Golf course						
In-line skating						
Play Equipment						
Soccer fields						
Softball / Baseball fields						
Swimming beaches						
Swimming pools						
Tennis courts						
Trails						
Volleyball courts						
Wildlife observation						
Other:						
Amenities						
Benches						
Community center / Indoor facilities						
Grills						
Picnic tables						
Restrooms						
Shelters						
Water fountains						
Other:						
Special Features						
Archaeological sites*						
Historical sites & structures*						
Lakes or ponds						
Prairie remnants						
Rivers or streams						
Wetlands						
Woodlots / Forests						
Other:						

Note: This table will need to be expanded to compile data for more than five sites.

*The State Historic Preservation Office is responsible for developing and maintaining inventories of historic and prehistoric properties in the state. For information please contact Dr. Steve Poyser, Preservation Planner, Phone: 503.378.4168 x 297, Email: steven.poyser@state.or.us

FORM 7:
ACCESSIBILITY CHECKLIST

1. Is parking in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)?
2. Does a path of travel from parking, street or sidewalk to the recreation area or facility exist and meet ADA requirements?
3. Are conveniences (e.g., water fountains) along the path of travel accessible?
4. Is the entrance signed appropriately? Does it meet ADA requirements?
5. Are use areas (e.g., ball fields, spectator areas, concessions, passive areas) able to be used by a person with a disability?
6. Are use areas designed to encourage and maximize interaction among people with and without disabilities?
7. Can existing facilities and experiences be modified for use by persons with a disability? Have such modifications been made?
8. Does the surfacing allow unassisted, unimpeded travel by a person in a wheelchair?
9. When an area and facility is not readily accessible to and usable by a person with a disability is another area or facility providing similar experiences nearby and accessible?
10. When an area is not readily accessible to and usable by a person with a disability, is this area scheduled to be made accessible and included in a transition plan?

Source: McGovern, 1992

**FORM 8:
SOCIO-ECONOMIC INFORMATION**

A. Census data*:

Jurisdiction	Population			
	1970	1980	1990	2000
County: _____				
Community: _____				

B. What population trends are evident?

C. Is this trend expected to continue? Why?

D. Population age breakdown*:

Under 5 years _____	45-64 years _____
5-19 years _____	65-84 years _____
20-24 years _____	85 years and more _____
25-44 years _____	

E. What minority groups are present in the community*?

What percentage of the population does each comprise?

F. Does the community have disabled residents with special needs?

G. What are the major types of occupations in the community?

H. What is the average income and income distribution of the population*?
What percentage of the community's households have an income below the poverty level*?

I. Are there other features of your community that might affect resident's recreation needs (e.g., single-parent households with children below the poverty level)*?

J. What are the sources of the information entered in this form (e.g., Regional or County Planning Commission, Center for Population Research and Census—Portland State University, US Census Bureau)?

* See Addendum 8: Oregon Census Data. Larger communities should use census tract information for local planning purposes.

FORM 9:
RESOLUTION TO ADOPT THE PLAN

The following sample resolution can be used by the appropriate elective body to adopt the completed community park and recreation plan.

WHEREAS, the _____ (Corporate Name)
recognizes the importance of parks and recreation to the quality of life of the residents of
_____, Oregon

WHEREAS, the need to provide quality park and recreation services for residents is
recognized, and

WHEREAS, the importance of sound planning in order to effectively meet the park and
recreation needs of its citizens is understood,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE
_____ does adopt the Park and Recreation Plan, to be its
official plan for the next ___ years, to guide the provision of park and recreational services in
our community.

Passed and signed this ___ day of _____, 20__.

ATTEST:

President / Mayor

Clerk / Secretary

ADDENDUM 1: ACCESSIBILITY MANDATES

Section 504

The 1973 Federal Rehabilitation Act was amended in 1978 by adding Section 504. This section prohibits discrimination against individuals with disabilities (mobility, visual, hearing or mental) in all programs receiving federal financial assistance. Each federal agency subject to this act has developed and enforces regulations for federally assisted programs under their authority. Section 504 requires the self-evaluation of facilities and programs to assess the extent to which regulations are met.

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)

ADA is a comprehensive law that took effect in 1992, making **access to recreation and play settings a guaranteed civil right for all Americans.**

Design that approaches site and facility planning from the perspective of use for all, not just able-bodied users, is called universal design. The key to universal design is awareness and flexibility in the park environment to meet different accessibility needs.

If an organization's accessibility self-evaluations (See Form 7) indicate that site and facility modifications are necessary, a transition plan to accomplish the adaptations must be prepared. Many local organizations have already complied with accessibility requirements. If your agency has done so, you should briefly describe your evaluation and findings in the community park and recreation plan. Any necessary structural changes to park and recreation facilities should be included in the plan's action program.

Facilities constructed with federal or state assistance or located on land acquired with federal or state assistance must be designed and constructed in conformance with ADA.

For assistance on architectural specifications outlined in ADA and accessibility guidelines for play areas, recreational facilities and outdoor developed areas contact:

U.S. Architectural & Transportation Barriers Compliance Board
Suite 1000, 1331 F. Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20004-1111
Phone: 800.872.2253
Website: <http://www.access-board.gov/>


For accessibility guidance regarding recreational facilities in Oregon contact:

Northwest ADA/IT Center
Oregon Health & Science University
P.O. Box 574
Portland, Oregon 97207-0574
Email: nwada@ohsu.edu
Phone: 800.949.4232
Website: <http://www.nwada.org/>

Oregon Disabilities Commission
Mr. Darrel Ackerman
Phone: 541.343.3262
Email: adaack@aol.com

ADDENDUM 2: COMMUNITY MAP

Base maps of this type are available from the Oregon Department of Transportation.



ADDENDUM 3: OREGON RECREATION FACILITIES INVENTORY²

Facility	Average Number in Oregon per 1,000 Population	Number in Your Community per 1,000 Population
Baseball & Softball Fields	.71	
Basketball Goals	1.04	
Community Walking Trail/Path Miles	.13	
Day-Use Picnic Tables	7.46	
Equipped Play Area Acres	.36	
Fishing Pier Linear Feet	23.17	
Football/Rugby/Soccer Fields	.52	
Golf Course Holes	.57	
Nature/Interpretive Trail Miles	.18	
Soccer Fields	.21	
Outdoor Swimming Pools	.035	
Outdoor Tennis Courts	.37	

Source: 2001 Oregon Statewide Outdoor Recreational Resource/Facility Inventory Bulletin (a component of the 2002-2005 Oregon Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan)

Note: This table can be used to compare the supply of these facilities in a community per 1,000 current residents and/or 1,000 estimated residents to the average statewide supply for these facilities.

² Data is provided for recreation facilities typically supplied by local governments. For data on additional facilities, contact Terry Bergerson, Oregon Parks and Recreation Department, 1115 Commercial Street NE, Salem, Oregon 97301-1002. Telephone: 503.378.4168 x 305, Email: terry.bergerson@state.or.us

ADDENDUM 4: PARTICIPATION IN OUTDOOR RECREATION ACTIVITIES

Activity	Percent of Population Participation in Your SCORP Planning Region ³
Baseball	
Biking	
Bird Watching	
Fishing From a Boat	
Fishing From a Bank	
Fishing From a Dock or Pier	
Canoeing	
Golfing	
In-line Skating / Skateboarding	
Nature / Wildlife Observation	
Outdoor Basketball	
Outdoor Court Games (volleyball, badminton)	
Outdoor Tennis	
Picnicking	
Running / Walking for Exercise	
Sightseeing/Driving for Pleasure	
Soccer	
Softball	
Swimming in an Outdoor Pool	
Using Park Playground Equipment	
Walking for Pleasure	

Note: Activities included are those typically pursued by residents of small communities in or near to their community.

³ Please record Regional Population Participation Percentages from Chapter Three of the 2003-2007 Oregon Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan.

ADDENDUM 5: GROUP BRAINSTORMING TECHNIQUE

This appendix describes a technique that enables a group to answer questions effectively and efficiently. The technique is designed to encourage both individual and group creativity and result in a group consensus. It limits and focuses interaction among team members in order to arrive at the needed team result in an efficient manner. The method has been adapted from "brainstorming" techniques originally developed to stimulate group creativity in developing advertising campaigns and techniques developed in the field of group dynamics to study how groups reach a consensus.

The technique is commonly used in a variety of related forms in situations where groups are working together to generate ideas, build on each other's ideas, combine these individual ideas and then decide as a group which ideas are the best. For example, in preparing a park and recreation plan, the technique can be used for deciding what are the community's highest priority needs and issues, formulating objectives for a goal and identifying strategies to meet an objective.

First, the chairperson or facilitator, working with a flip chart and marker, **asks the team to suggest answers to a question** such as, "What are the most important park and recreation concerns in Pleasant Town?" Each team member in turn suggests one answer, which the facilitator lists on the chart. The team member is asked just to suggest one item, not to explain, justify or argue for it. Similarly, team members are asked not to discuss at this point items suggested by other team members.

The facilitator proceeds around the team **listing items until the suggestions are exhausted**. Team members can skip a turn and suggest additional items in later rounds as they occur to them. The facilitator encourages members to suggest items they are hesitant about. Often these turn out to be the more unusual and creative ideas. Initial suggestions can be built on and improved by other group members. Preventing comments on the suggestions during this phase encourages members to offer ideas they might otherwise be reluctant to suggest.

The listed ideas should be displayed so members can examine the entire list. **The facilitator now asks if there are any suggestions the group does not understand**. If so, the member who suggested the idea explains it, with the facilitator adding material to the list to clarify the item's meaning. **The facilitator then asks if there are any items that could be combined**. Then members are finally asked whether there are **any items that someone thinks should not be on the list**. These questions stimulate focused group discussion that results in a refined list of items understood by all members.

The team next prioritizes the list. This can occur in a variety of ways, but often is accomplished by giving each member a number of votes that they can use to select the items they believe are the most important. For example, each member of the group might be asked individually to choose the three items they believe are the highest priority or most important after being given a few minutes to reflect on the list. These votes are then announced member by member, noted by the facilitator on the list and then counted or combined to identify the team's priority order of items.

There should be some convergence among the members in their votes. If there is not, that is, if votes are evenly distributed among the items, further discuss the items and the disagreement about their importance and then revote.

Some members may be disappointed with the results, especially if items they consider important are not ranked highly by the group. It is useful to note that the results at this point are provisional in the sense that this is just one of many stages in the planning process. As the team proceeds through the process, there will be ample opportunity to revisit earlier decisions, especially as the public reviews the team's work and public input is used to modify the plan's components.

This technique can be even more productive and efficient if team members are provided with the questions to be brainstormed prior to the meeting and are urged to come to the meeting ready with ideas to share with the team.

ADDENDUM 6: EXAMPLE OF A VISION STATEMENT

Over the next ten years, Pleasant Town is expected to grow and expand. With this expansion comes the challenge of meeting the increasing recreation needs of Pleasant Town's present and future residents. Pleasant Town is a community that understands that parks and recreation are a critical element of a community's quality of life. Recreation brings together all segments of our community and makes us more healthy and productive. The importance of recreation to Pleasant Town's present and future economic viability is also understood.

Pleasant Town is a community determined to preserve those aspects of its heritage that are unique and represent important moments in our community's cultural and natural history. This heritage can provide settings for individual, family and group recreation activity, community gatherings and remain an important part of what will continue to make Pleasant Town a special place in which to live, work and play.

In 2012, Pleasant Town will be proud to be a community that works together to provide quality parks and recreation services for its residents, including:

- A refurbished historic park with grounds, vegetation and facilities that have been rehabilitated and made accessible for the use of all Pleasant Town's residents including the disabled.
- Increased open space including a new community park and new neighborhood playgrounds readily accessible to all our community's children.
- Increased and improved opportunities for popular recreation opportunities such as swimming and softball, especially for an organized league.
- New programs that better meet the recreation needs of all segments of our community.
- The permanently protected East Side Prairie providing education and enjoyment for residents and visitors.
- The Rippling River Corridor restored through the business district with natural vegetation providing beautification, passive recreation and a walking path.
- The Historic Jones Farmstead protected and used for the town's park and recreation office and a community heritage museum.
- A trail on the abandoned railroad corridor connecting downtown with the Long Ridge State Trail and its associated regional trail network.

Note: The Vision Statement is written with its specific elements identified in outline format. This assists in translating the elements of the vision statement to goals.

ADDENDUM 7: POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

OPRD Administered Funds:

Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) assists local units of government and some state agencies, counties, port districts, park and recreation districts and Native American Tribes in acquisition of lands and waters or for the development of public outdoor recreation facilities that are consistent with the outdoor recreation goals and objectives contained in the Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan. LWCF provides funding assistance up to 50% of approved project costs. The minimum federal share can be no less than \$12,500 (\$25,000 total project cost).

Local Government Grant Program assists city and county park and recreation departments, METRO, park and recreation districts and port districts with funding for the acquisition, development and rehabilitation of park and recreation areas and facilities. The program provides for up to 50% funding assistance, except for cities/districts with a population of less than 5,000 and counties with a population of less than 30,000. The matching requirement is 40%.

County Opportunity Grants Program provides funding for the acquisition, development, rehabilitation and planning for county park and recreation sites that provide, or will provide, overnight camping facilities. Grants from counties with a population of 30,000 and under will require a 25% local match and counties over 30,000 – a 50% match.

Recreational Trails Program (RTP) provides up to 80% federal funding assistance for acquisition, development, rehabilitation and maintenance of both motorized and non-motorized recreation trails to federal, state and local government agencies and not-for-profit organizations.

All-Terrain Vehicle Grants Program provides up to 100% reimbursement to government agencies, not-for-profit organizations and individuals to acquire, develop, operate and maintain land for off-highway vehicle parks and trails that are open and accessible to the public.

OPRD publishes manuals that explain how recreation providers may apply for grant assistance from these programs. These manuals are also available on the OPRD website at: <http://www.prd.state.or.us/grants.php>.

For additional information about these grant programs please contact:

OPRD Administered Grant Program	OPRD Contact
Land & Water Conservation Fund Program Local Government Grant Program County Opportunity Grants Program	Marilyn Lippincott Phone: 503.378.4168 x 241 Email: marilyn.lippincott@state.or.us
Recreational Trails Program	Sean Loughran Phone: 503.378.4168 x 246 Email: sean.loughran@state.or.us
All Terrain Vehicle Program	Glennys Lindsay Phone: 503.378.4168 x 477 Email: glennys.lindsay@state.or.us

Marine Board Administered Funds:

Facility Grant Program provides competitive grants to public agencies (local, state and a pass-through option to federal entities) for the acquisition, development, expansion, and rehabilitation of public motorized boating facilities located on all waters of the state. Projects may be submitted by cities, counties, park and recreation districts, port districts and state agencies. In addition, counties with consent of the County Commission may sponsor a Federal Agency participant such as the U.S. Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management or Corps of Engineers. Facility Grants are state funds requiring at least 25% applicant match, usually a combination of hard (cash) and soft (in-kind) funds.

Maintenance Assistance Program provides funding assistance to augment existing levels of routine maintenance at improved marine facilities throughout the state provided by eligible participants. Eligible participants are encouraged to use MAP funds to enhance their existing level of funding and to improve the quality of maintenance provided. Eligible facilities include boat ramps, boarding floats, restrooms, parking areas, access roads, transient tie-up floats, vessel waste collection and related facilities.

Boating Infrastructure Grant Program provides funding for the development and rehabilitation of transient tie-up facilities at public and private facilities used principally by non-trailer recreational boats.

Clean Vessel Grant Program provides funding for new, replacement or upgrades to vessel waste collection facilities to include: pumpouts, potty dump stations, and directly related support structures, utilities or other improvements necessary for proper operation. Eligible participants include any privately owned marina/moorage facility that have or will have the capability to provide an area available for a vessel waste collection system open and available for general public use.

The Oregon State Marine Board publishes manuals that explain how recreation providers may apply for grant assistance from these programs. For copies of the grant manuals or additional information about these grant programs please contact:

Janine Belleque
Oregon State Marine Board
435 Commercial St. NE
P.O. Box 14145
Salem, Oregon 97309-5065
Phone: 503.378.8587 x 251
Email: marine.board@state.or.us
Website: <http://www.osmb.state.or.us>

Other Potential Funding Sources:

Urban Park & Recreation Recovery Program: <http://www.ncrc.nps.gov/programs/uprr/index.html>
Rivers, Trails & Conservation Assistance Program: <http://www.ncrc.nps.gov/programs/rtca/index.html>
Baseball Tomorrow Fund: <http://www.baseballtomorrowfund.com/>
Bikes Belong Coalition: <http://www.bikesbelong.org/>
U.S. Soccer Foundation: <http://www.ussoccerfoundation.org/GNT.html>
KaBoom!: <http://www.kaboom.org/contact>
Northwest Health Foundation: <http://www.nwhf.org>

ADDENDUM 8: OREGON CENSUS DATA
OREGON POPULATION DATA

Oregon Population Data					
	1970	1980	1990	2000	% Change (1990 to 2000)
State	2,091,385	2,633,105	2,842,321	3,421,399	+20.4
County					
Baker	14,919	16,134	15,317	16,741	+9.3
Benton	53,776	68,211	70,811	78,153	+10.4
Clackamas	166,088	241,919	278,850	338,391	+21.4
Clatsop	28,473	32,489	33,301	35,630	+7.0
Columbia	28,790	35,646	37,557	43,560	+16.0
Coos	56,515	64,047	60,273	62,779	+4.2
Crook	9,985	13,091	14,111	19,182	+35.9
Curry	13,006	16,992	19,327	21,137	+9.4
Deschutes	30,442	62,142	74,958	115,367	+53.9
Douglas	71,743	93,748	94,649	100,399	+6.1
Gilliam	2,342	2,057	1,717	1,915	+11.5
Grant	6,996	8,210	7,853	7,935	+1.0
Harney	7,215	8,314	7,060	7,609	+7.8
Hood River	13,187	15,835	16,903	20,411	+20.8
Jackson	94,533	132,456	146,389	181,269	+23.8
Jefferson	8,548	11,599	13,676	19,009	+39.0
Josephine	35,746	58,855	62,649	75,726	+20.9
Klamath	50,021	59,117	57,702	63,775	+10.5
Lake	6,343	7,532	7,186	7,422	+3.3
Lane	213,358	275,226	282,912	322,959	+14.2
Lincoln	25,755	35,264	38,889	44,479	+14.4
Linn	71,914	89,495	91,227	103,069	+13.0
Malheur	23,169	26,896	26,038	31,615	+21.4
Marion	151,309	204,692	228,483	284,834	+24.7
Morrow	4,465	7,519	7,625	10,995	+44.2
Multnomah	556,667	562,640	583,887	660,486	+13.1
Polk	35,349	45,203	49,541	62,380	+25.9
Sherman	2,139	2,172	1,918	1,934	+.8
Tillamook	17,930	21,164	21,570	24,262	+12.5
Umatilla	44,923	58,861	59,249	70,548	+19.1
Union	19,377	23,921	23,598	24,530	+3.9
Wallowa	6,247	7,273	6,911	7,226	+4.6
Wasco	20,133	21,732	21,683	23,791	+9.7
Washington	157,920	245,808	311,554	445,342	+42.9
Wheeler	1,849	1,513	1,396	1,547	+10.8
Yamhill	40,213	55,332	65,551	84,992	+29.7

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000, Oregon State Library

Oregon Population Data					
Community	1970	1980	1990	2000	% Growth 1990-2000
Adair Village	N/A	589	554	536	-3.2%
Adams	219	240	223	297	33.2%
Adrian	N/A	162	131	147	12.2%
Albany	18,181	26,511	29,540	40,852	38.3%
Amity	708	1,092	1,175	1,478	25.8%
Antelope	51	39	34	59	73.5%
Arlington	375	521	425	524	23.3%
Ashland	12,342	14,943	16,252	19,522	20.3%
Astoria	10,244	9,996	10,069	9,813	-2.5%
Athens	872	965	997	1,221	22.5%
Aumsville	590	1,432	1,650	3,003	82.0%
Aurora	306	523	567	655	15.5%
Baker City	9,354	9,471	9,140	9,860	7.9%
Bandon	1,832	2,311	2,215	2,833	27.9%
Banks	430	489	563	1,286	128.4%
Barlow	105	105	118	140	18.6%
Bay City	898	986	1,027	1,149	11.9%
Beaverton	18,577	5,937	53,310	76,129	42.8%
Bend	13,710	17,260	20,469	52,029	154.2%
Boardman	192	1,261	1,387	2,855	105.8%
Bonanza	230	270	323	415	28.5%
Brookings	2,720	2,637	4,400	5,447	23.8%
Brownsville	1,034	1,261	1,281	1,449	13.1%
Burns	3,293	3,579	2,913	3,064	5.2%
Butte Falls	358	428	252	439	74.2%
Canby	3,813	7,659	8,983	12,790	42.4%
Cannon Beach	779	1,187	1,221	1,588	30.1%
Canyon City	600	639	648	669	3.2%
Canyonville	940	1,288	1,219	1,293	6.1%
Carlton	1,126	1,302	1,289	1,514	17.5%
Cascade Locks	574	838	930	1,115	19.9%
Cave Junction	415	1,023	1,126	1,363	21.0%
Central Point	4,004	6,357	7,509	12,493	66.4%
Chiloquin	826	778	673	716	6.4%
Clatskanie	1,286	1,648	1,629	1,528	-6.2%
Coberg	665	699	763	969	27.0%
Columbia City	537	678	1,003	1,571	56.6%
Condon	973	783	635	759	19.5%
Coos Bay	13,466	14,424	15,076	15,374	2.0%
Coquille	4,437	4,481	4,121	4,184	1.5%
Cornelius	1,903	4,402	6,148	9,652	57.0%
Corvallis	35,056	40,960	44,757	49,322	10.2%

Oregon Population Data					
Community	1970	1980	1990	2000	% Growth 1990-2000
Cottage Grove	6,004	7,148	7,402	8,445	14.1%
Cove	363	451	507	594	17.2%
Creswell	1,199	1,770	2,431	3,579	47.2%
Culver	407	514	570	802	40.7%
Dallas	6,361	8,530	9,422	12,459	32.2%
Dayton	949	1,409	1,526	2,119	38.9%
Dayville	197	199	144	138	-4.2%
Depot Bay	N/A	723	870	1,174	34.9%
Detroit	328	367	331	262	-20.8%
Donald	231	267	316	608	92.4%
Drain	1,204	1,148	1,011	1,021	1.0%
Dufur	493	560	527	588	11.6%
Dundee	588	1,223	1,663	2,598	56.2%
Dunes City	976	1,124	1,081	1,241	14.8%
Durham	410	707	748	1,382	84.8%
Eagle Point	1,241	2,764	3,008	4,797	59.5%
Echo	479	624	499	650	30.3%
Elgin	1,375	1,701	1,586	1,654	4.3%
Elkton	176	155	172	147	-14.5%
Enterprise	1,680	2,003	1,905	1,895	-0.5%
Estacada	1,164	1,419	2,016	2,371	17.6%
Eugene	79,028	105,664	112,669	137,893	22.4%
Fairview	1,045	1,749	2,391	7,561	216.2%
Falls City	745	804	818	966	18.1%
Florence	2,246	4,411	5,162	7,263	40.7%
Forest Grove	8,275	11,499	13,559	17,708	30.6%
Fossil	511	535	399	469	17.5%
Garibaldi	1,083	999	887	877	2.5%
Gaston	429	471	563	563	6.6%
Gates	250	455	499	471	-5.6%
Gearhart	829	967	1,027	995	-3.1%
Gervais	746	799	992	2,009	102.5%
Gladstone	6,254	9,500	10,152	11,438	12.7%
Glendale	709	712	707	855	20.9%
Gold Beach	1,554	1,515	1,546	1,897	22.7%
Gold Hill	603	904	964	1,073	11.3%
Granite	4	17	8	24	200.0%
Grants Pass	12,455	15,032	17,488	23,003	31.5%
Grass Valley	153	164	160	171	6.9%
Greenhorn	N/A	N/A	0	0	0.00%
Gresham	10,030	33,005	68,235	90,205	32.2%
Haines	212	341	405	426	5.2%

Oregon Population Data					
Community	1970	1980	1990	2000	% Growth 1990-2000
Halfway	317	380	311	337	8.4%
Halsey	467	693	667	724	8.5%
Happy Valley	1,392	1,499	1,519	4,519	197.5%
Harrisburg	1,311	1,881	1,939	2,795	44.1%
Helix	152	155	150	183	22.0%
Heppner	1,429	1,498	1,412	1,395	-1.2%
Hermiston	4,893	8,408	10,040	13,154	31.0%
Hillsboro	14,675	27,664	37,520	70,186	87.7%
Hines	1,407	1,632	1,452	1,623	11.8%
Hood River	3,991	4,329	4,632	5,831	25.9%
Hubbard	975	1,640	1,881	2,483	32.0%
Huntington	507	539	522	522	-1.3%
Idanha	382	319	289	232	-19.7%
Imbler	169	292	299	284	-5.0%
Independence	2,594	4,024	4,425	6,035	36.4%
Ione	N/A	249	255	321	25.9%
Irrigon	261	700	737	1,702	130.9%
Island City	202	477	696	916	31.6%
Jacksonville	1,611	2,030	1,896	2,235	17.9%
Jefferson	936	1,702	1,805	2,487	37.8%
John Day	1,566	2,012	1,836	1,821	-0.8%
Johnson City	N/A	378	586	634	8.2%
Jordon Valley	196	473	364	239	-34.3%
Joseph	839	999	1,073	1,054	-1.8%
Junction City	2,373	3,320	3,670	4,721	28.6%
Keizer	N/A	N/A	21,884	32,203	47.2%
King City	1,427	1,853	2,060	1,949	-5.4%
Klamath Falls	15,775	16,661	17,737	19,462	9.7%
La Grande	9,645	11,354	11,766	12,327	4.8%
Lafayette	786	1,215	1,292	2,586	100.2%
Lake Oswego	14,615	22,527	30,576	35,278	15.4%
Lakeside	N/A	1,453	1,437	1,371	-4.6%
Lakeview	2,705	2,770	2,526	2,474	-2.1%
Lebanon	7,277	10,413	10,950	12,950	18.3%
Lexington	230	307	286	263	-8.0%
Lincoln City	4,196	5,469	5,892	7,437	26.2%
Lonerock	12	26	11	24	118.2%
Long Creek	196	252	249	228	-8.4%
Lostine	196	250	231	263	13.9%
Lowell	567	661	785	857	9.2%
Lyons	645	877	938	1,008	7.5%
Madras	1,689	2,235	3,443	5,078	47.5%
Malin	486	539	725	638	-12.0%

Oregon Population Data					
Community	1970	1980	1990	2000	% Growth 1990-2000
Manzanita	261	443	513	564	9.9%
Maupin	428	495	456	411	-9.9%
Maywood Park	1,230	845	781	777	-0.5%
McMinnville	10,125	14,080	17,894	26,499	48.1%
Medford	28,454	39,746	46,951	63,154	34.5%
Merrill	722	822	837	897	7.2%
Metolius	270	451	450	635	41.1%
Mill City	1,451	1,565	1,555	1,537	-1.2%
Millersburg	N/A	562	715	651	-9.0%
Milton-Freewater	4,105	5,086	5,533	5,533	16.9%
Milwaukie	16,444	17,931	18,692	20,490	9.6%
Mitchell	196	183	163	170	4.3%
Molalla	2,005	2,992	3,651	5,647	54.7%
Monmouth	5,237	5,594	6,288	7,741	23.1%
Monroe	443	412	448	607	35.5%
Monument	161	192	162	151	-6.8%
Moro	290	336	292	337	15.4%
Mosier	217	340	244	410	68.0%
Mt. Angel	1,973	2,876	2,778	3,121	12.3%
Mt. Vernon	423	569	538	595	10.6%
Myrtle Creek	2,733	3,365	3,063	3,419	11.6%
Myrtle Point	2,511	2,859	2,712	2,451	-9.6%
Nehalem	241	258	232	203	-12.5%
Newberg	6,507	10,394	13,086	18,064	38.0%
Newport	5,188	7,519	8,437	9,532	13.0%
North Bend	8,553	9,779	9,614	9,544	-0.7%
North Plains	690	715	972	1,605	65.1%
North Powder	304	430	448	489	9.2%
Nyssa	2,620	2,862	2,629	3,163	20.3%
Oakland	1,010	886	844	954	13.0%
Oakridge	3,422	3,680	3,063	3,148	2.8%
Ontario	6,523	8,814	9,392	10,985	17.0%
Oregon City	9,176	14,673	14,698	25,754	75.2%
Paisley	260	343	350	247	-29.4%
Pendleton	13,197	14,521	15,126	16,354	8.1%
Philomath	1,688	2,673	2,983	3,838	28.7%
Phoenix	1,287	2,309	3,239	4,060	25.3%
Pilot Rock	1,612	1,630	1,478	1,532	3.7%
Port Orford	1,037	1,061	1,025	1,153	12.5%
Portland	379,967	366,383	438,802	529,121	20.6%
Powers	842	819	682	734	7.6%
Prairie City	867	1,106	1,117	1,080	-3.3%
Prescott	105	73	63	72	14.3%

Oregon Population Data					
Community	1970	1980	1990	2000	% Growth 1990-2000
Prineville	4,101	5,276	5,355	7,356	37.4%
Rainier	1,731	1,655	1,674	1,687	0.8%
Redmond	3,721	6,452	7,165	13,481	88.2%
Reedsport	4,039	4,984	4,796	4,378	-8.7%
Richland	133	181	161	147	-8.7%
Riddle	1,042	1,265	1,143	1,014	-11.3%
Rivergrove	N/A	314	294	324	10.2%
Rockaway Beach	665	906	970	1,267	30.6%
Rogue River	841	1,308	1,759	1,847	5.0%
Roseburg	14,461	16,644	17,032	20,017	17.5%
Rufus	317	352	295	268	-9.2%
Salem	68,725	89,091	107,793	136,924	27.0%
Sandy	1,544	2,905	4,152	5,385	29.7%
Scappoose	1,859	3,213	3,529	4,976	41.0%
Scio	447	579	623	695	11.6%
Scotts Mills	208	249	283	312	10.2%
Seaside	4,402	5,193	5,359	5,900	10.1%
Seneca	N/A	285	191	223	16.8%
Shady Cove	N/A	1,097	1,351	2,307	70.8%
Shaniko	58	30	26	26	0.0%
Sheridan	1,881	2,249	3,979	3,570	-10.3%
Sherwood	1,396	2,386	3,093	11,791	281.2%
Siletz	596	1,001	992	1,133	22.4%
Silverton	4,301	5,168	5,635	7,414	31.6%
Sisters	516	696	679	959	41.2%
Sodaville	125	171	192	290	51.0%
Spray	161	155	149	140	-6.0%
Springfield	26,874	41,621	44,683	52,864	18.3%
St. Helens	6,212	7,064	7,535	10,019	33.0%
St. Paul	346	312	322	354	9.9%
Stanfield	891	1,568	1,568	1,979	26.2%
Stayton	3,170	4,396	5,011	6,816	36.0%
Sublimity	634	1,077	1,491	2,148	44.1%
Summerville	76	143	111	117	5.4%
Sumpter	120	133	119	171	43.7%
Sutherlin	3,070	4,560	5,020	6,669	32.8%
Sweet Home	3,799	6,921	6,850	8,016	17.0%
Talent	1,389	2,577	3,274	5,589	70.7%
Tangent	N/A	478	556	933	67.8%
The Dalles	10,423	10,820	11,060	12,156	9.9%
Tigard	6,499	22,527	29,344	41,223	40.5%
Tillamook	3,968	3,991	4,001	4,352	8.8%
Toledo	2,818	3,151	3,174	3,472	9.4%

Oregon Population Data					
Community	1970	1980	1990	2000	% Growth 1990-2000
Troutdale	1,661	5,908	7,852	13,777	75.5%
Tualatin	750	7,483	14,664	22,791	55.4%
Turner	846	1,116	1,281	1,199	-6.4%
Ukiah	N/A	249	250	255	2.0%
Umatilla	679	3,199	3,046	4,978	63.4%
Union	1,531	2,062	1,847	1,926	4.3%
Unity	N/A	115	87	131	50.6%
Vale	1,448	1,558	1,491	1,976	32.5%
Veneta	1,377	2,449	2,519	2,755	9.4%
Vernonia	1,643	1,785	1,808	2,228	23.2%
Waldport	700	1,274	1,595	2,050	28.5%
Wallowa	811	847	748	869	16.2%
Warrenton	1,825	2,493	3,270	4,096	25.3%
Wasco	412	415	374	381	1.9%
Waterloo	186	211	191	239	25.1%
West Linn	7,091	11,358	16,367	22,261	36.0%
Westfir	N/A	312	278	276	-0.7%
Weston	660	719	606	717	18.3%
Wheeler	262	319	335	391	16.7%
Willamina	1,193	1,749	1,748	1,844	5.5%
Wilsonville	1,001	2,920	7,106	13,991	96.9%
Winston	2,468	3,359	3,773	4,613	22.3%
Wood Village	1,533	2,253	2,814	2,860	1.6%
Woodburn	7,495	11,196	13,404	20,100	50.0%
Yachats	411	482	533	617	15.8%
Yamhill	516	690	867	794	-8.4%
Yoncalla	675	805	919	1,052	14.5%

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000, Oregon State Library

Oregon Population by Age Group Category

2000 Oregon Population by Age Group Category							
	Under 5 years (%)	5-19 years (%)	20-24 years (%)	25-44 years (%)	45-64 years (%)	65-84 years (%)	85 years or more (%)
State	6.5	21.1	6.7	29.2	23.7	11.1	1.7
County							
Baker	5.3	21.2	3.6	23.7	27.3	16.4	2.6
Benton	5.1	22.4	14.1	26.7	21.5	8.9	1.4
Clackamas	6.5	22.2	5.5	28.7	26.1	9.6	1.4
Clatsop	5.6	21.3	5.6	25.2	26.7	13.6	2.0
Columbia	6.4	23.3	4.7	28.0	26.0	10.4	1.2
Coos	4.9	19.7	4.5	24.0	27.9	16.7	2.4
Crook	6.5	22.4	5.3	25.5	25.7	13.1	1.5
Curry	4.1	16.8	3.1	20.0	29.4	24.0	2.6
Deschutes	6.1	21.1	5.4	28.6	25.7	11.6	1.4
Douglas	5.6	21.0	5.0	24.2	26.5	15.9	1.9
Gilliam	4.5	20.5	3.6	25.6	26.7	16.6	2.5
Grant	5.7	22.3	3.3	24.0	27.9	14.3	2.5
Harney	5.7	22.5	4.2	26.5	26.1	13.4	1.6
Hood River	7.4	23.1	5.7	29.5	21.5	10.9	2.0
Jackson	6.0	21.1	6.0	25.5	25.3	13.9	2.1
Jefferson	7.7	24.5	5.4	26.9	23.2	11.3	1.2
Josephine	5.3	20.0	4.2	23.2	27.2	17.7	2.4
Klamath	6.4	22.1	5.9	25.5	25.2	13.2	1.7
Lake	5.0	21.5	3.4	24.2	28.1	15.8	1.9
Lane	5.8	20.5	8.5	27.5	24.3	11.6	1.7
Lincoln	4.9	18.8	4.3	23.5	29.0	17.6	1.9
Linn	6.8	21.9	5.7	27.0	24.1	12.6	1.9
Malheur	7.6	23.2	7.4	27.2	21.1	11.8	1.9
Marion	7.7	22.7	7.2	28.7	21.2	10.6	1.7
Morrow	8.5	25.2	5.9	27.3	22.4	9.6	1.1
Multnomah	6.4	18.6	7.6	33.8	22.5	9.5	1.6
Polk	6.3	22.8	7.9	24.7	23.5	12.3	2.5
Sherman	5.1	23.6	3.6	23.4	26.1	16.2	2.0
Tillamook	4.8	19.6	4.2	23.5	28.0	17.8	2.0
Umatilla	7.5	23.2	6.5	28.2	22.2	10.7	1.5
Union	5.9	22.7	8.2	23.5	25.1	12.4	2.3
Wallowa	4.9	21.2	3.0	21.9	30.1	16.6	2.2
Wasco	6.5	21.2	5.0	25.2	25.4	14.5	2.2
Washington	7.9	21.4	6.8	34.0	21.0	7.6	1.2
Wheeler	4.7	19.2	2.1	19.3	31.4	21.0	2.3
Yamhill	7.0	23.6	7.7	28.5	21.3	10.2	1.6

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000

2000 Oregon Population by Age Group Category							
Community	Under 5 years (%)	5-19 years (%)	20-24 years (%)	25-44 years (%)	45-64 years (%)	65-84 years (%)	85 years or more (%)
Adair Village	9.1	30.3	5.6	32.8	19.0	3.2	0.0
Adams	7.1	22.9	6.7	29.3	22.5	10.8	0.7
Adrian	6.1	21.7	7.5	22.4	21.7	19.7	0.7
Albany	7.6	21.1	6.7	29.4	21.9	10.7	2.0
Amity	9.3	27.7	6.2	29.4	18.7	7.9	0.7
Antelope	5.1	17.0	1.7	18.7	32.2	22.1	3.4
Arlington	5.3	22.9	4.2	28.1	25.3	13.5	0.6
Ashland	4.1	20.4	11.9	23.3	25.5	12.4	2.5
Astoria	6.4	20.4	6.3	26.4	24.4	13.4	2.5
Athena	8.4	25.1	3.4	27.2	23.1	11.7	1.1
Aumsville	10.8	28.7	5.5	31.9	17.4	5.2	0.6
Aurora	7.2	19.6	4.7	27.8	27.6	11.9	1.2
Baker City	6.1	20.9	4.3	25.4	23.6	16.4	3.4
Bandon	4.1	16.9	2.8	19.4	27.4	24.4	4.9
Banks	10.9	26.9	5.8	39.9	12.5	3.5	0.5
Barlow	5.7	30.7	5.0	28.6	19.3	10.0	0.7
Bay City	5.0	17.4	4.4	26.4	27.5	17.7	1.4
Beaverton	7.2	20.3	8.1	35.1	20.4	7.4	1.5
Bend	6.9	20.4	7.4	31.1	21.8	10.6	1.8
Boardman	12.7	28.7	7.7	30.5	15.1	4.9	0.5
Bonanza	9.2	29.0	4.6	25.1	20.5	11.1	0.7
Brookings	5.4	20.1	4.0	23.1	23.6	20.4	3.5
Brownsville	7.0	22.9	5.0	26.4	27.0	10.2	1.4
Burns	6.0	22.5	4.9	26.6	23.7	14.2	2.1
Butte Falls	7.3	27.8	3.6	28.4	20.9	10.5	1.4
Canby	8.4	24.8	5.8	29.6	19.6	9.7	1.9
Cannon Beach	5.0	18.3	6.4	21.5	32.1	15.8	0.9
Canyon City	7.3	24.1	3.7	31.2	20.5	11.7	1.5
Canyonville	5.4	21.0	5.5	22.3	25.6	17.4	2.8
Carlton	8.4	25.3	5.4	31.0	20.8	8.2	1.0
Cascade Locks	6.8	23.6	4.9	31.5	21.4	10.6	1.1
Cave Junction	7.6	21.6	5.3	21.8	21.8	19.5	2.3
Central Point	7.8	23.5	5.2	29.2	20.2	12.2	2.0
Chiloquin	8.1	29.3	4.5	23.6	22.8	10.6	1.1
Clatskanie	7.2	24.9	4.8	26.1	21.0	13.7	2.4
Coberg	6.9	23.7	4.4	28.7	25.8	9.2	1.1
Columbia City	5.9	22.5	3.4	25.5	30.5	11.4	0.8
Condon	3.4	17.6	2.5	21.9	26.6	23.1	4.9
Coos Bay	5.7	20.3	5.7	25.2	23.9	16.6	2.6
Coquille	5.0	20.1	5.2	25.4	24.1	17.2	3.0
Cornelius	10.0	25.5	8.0	33.6	16.9	5.5	0.6
Corvallis	4.9	21.2	20.1	26.9	16.9	8.3	1.7

2000 Oregon Population by Age Group Category							
Community	Under 5 years %	5-19 years (%)	20-24 years (%)	25-44 years (%)	45-64 years (%)	65-84 years (%)	85 years or more (%)
Cottage Grove	7.0	23.0	5.8	26.4	21.7	13.9	2.1
Cove	7.6	21.2	3.4	23.0	27.6	15.6	1.5
Creswell	8.8	24.7	6.1	30.8	18.4	9.4	1.6
Culver	10.0	30.3	5.4	30.5	12.9	9.7	1.4
Dallas	7.5	23.0	5.3	26.0	20.9	14.0	3.5
Dayton	8.3	31.2	4.9	30.2	17.7	7.1	0.5
Dayville	5.8	19.6	5.1	24.6	23.9	18.8	2.2
Depot Bay	3.1	12.7	2.6	22.1	35.7	22.5	1.4
Detroit	6.1	17.1	3.8	23.3	33.3	14.5	1.9
Donald	6.1	27.8	4.6	35.5	20.3	4.9	0.7
Drain	5.5	24.9	5.2	27.5	23.8	11.9	1.4
Dufur	3.6	25.1	2.2	22.0	28.4	16.8	1.9
Dundee	8.1	24.5	4.8	32.6	20.6	8.5	0.7
Dunes City	2.2	15.9	1.3	16.2	37.2	26.1	1.3
Durham	8.8	24.0	4.8	29.6	27.0	5.8	0.2
Eagle Point	8.5	27.1	6.4	29.2	19.7	8.0	1.1
Echo	7.5	25.0	6.2	26.1	22.8	10.8	1.7
Elgin	7.3	23.7	5.0	25.1	23.9	12.7	2.4
Elkton	2.7	15.6	7.5	22.4	29.2	21.8	0.7
Enterprise	4.5	21.7	3.4	22.5	27.1	17.8	3.1
Estacada	6.9	26.0	7.2	28.4	20.4	9.2	1.9
Eugene	5.3	19.7	12.6	28.4	21.8	10.1	2.0
Fairview	9.0	21.7	8.8	33.7	19.6	6.8	0.6
Falls City	7.0	26.3	3.0	26.7	22.4	12.3	2.2
Florence	3.8	14.8	3.3	16.1	24.0	34.1	4.2
Forest Grove	8.1	23.8	8.8	28.7	16.9	10.1	3.6
Fossil	5.3	14.5	3.0	17.0	32.8	24.3	3.0
Garibaldi	2.2	16.1	4.0	21.4	31.3	22.6	2.4
Gaston	8.2	33.8	5.2	30.7	18.2	3.3	0.7
Gates	6.6	16.0	3.4	22.1	31.3	19.8	1.1
Gearhart	2.5	19.3	2.5	21.3	35.5	16.9	1.7
Gervais	11.0	31.0	8.7	34.1	10.6	4.3	0.3
Gladstone	6.7	22.5	6.4	29.3	23.4	10.1	1.4
Glendale	8.8	28.8	5.8	26.9	20.8	7.9	0.9
Gold Beach	4.6	18.8	3.7	23.4	30.5	17.3	1.6
Gold Hill	7.4	23.0	4.9	27.4	25.9	9.9	1.5
Granite	-	-	-	20.9	66.6	12.5	-
Grants Pass	7.0	21.7	5.5	25.8	20.6	15.8	3.6
Grass Valley	4.7	21.6	3.5	22.3	21.6	22.8	3.5
Greenhorn	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gresham	8.0	22.8	7.9	30.3	21.2	8.3	1.5
Haines	7.5	21.2	4.2	26.3	24.1	15.3	1.4

2000 Oregon Population by Age Group Category							
Community	Under 5 years (%)	5-19 years (%)	20-24 years (%)	25-44 years (%)	45-64 years (%)	65-84 years (%)	85 years or more (%)
Halfway	4.5	23.1	2.1	20.5	26.0	21.4	2.4
Halsey	6.9	24.4	8.4	30.1	22.4	7.0	0.8
Happy Valley	7.4	26.3	2.7	30.1	26.6	6.3	0.4
Harrisburg	10.3	23.8	6.5	32.5	18.1	8.3	0.6
Helix	3.8	35.5	3.3	31.1	14.8	9.3	2.2
Heppner	5.9	20.9	3.7	24.3	24.9	17.0	3.3
Hermiston	8.9	24.1	7.5	27.9	20.1	9.8	1.7
Hillsboro	9.3	21.9	8.6	37.0	17.1	5.3	0.9
Hines	6.3	22.2	4.3	27.0	26.1	12.9	1.1
Hood River	8.2	20.7	7.0	32.6	18.4	10.2	3.0
Hubbard	9.1	28.3	6.2	32.8	16.4	6.6	0.6
Huntington	4.1	20.5	3.1	21.5	27.2	22.7	0.8
Idanha	6.0	26.8	3.9	30.2	24.5	8.6	-
Imbler	4.2	30.0	3.9	26.4	25.4	8.1	2.1
Independence	8.4	25.3	10.8	26.4	20.1	8.0	1.0
Ione	5.9	25.8	2.2	29.6	20.6	14.0	1.9
Irrigon	9.2	25.6	7.8	27.1	21.0	8.9	0.5
Island City	6.6	19.4	4.8	24.7	28.2	15.2	1.2
Jacksonville	3.6	17.2	2.4	20.1	32.0	21.8	2.8
Jefferson	10.3	26.5	5.7	30.4	19.8	6.6	0.6
John Day	7.1	22.8	4.9	23.2	23.8	14.4	4.0
Johnson City	5.5	18.0	4.9	30.0	26.5	13.2	1.9
Jordon Valley	3.3	21.0	3.8	20.9	30.5	16.7	3.8
Joseph	5.6	21.2	2.8	22.4	27.1	17.9	3.0
Junction City	7.5	22.9	7.2	27.9	19.6	11.8	3.1
Keizer	8.1	22.0	5.8	30.1	21.9	10.4	1.8
King City	0.3	0.8	0.4	2.9	16.7	59.2	19.8
Klamath Falls	7.0	22.4	9.2	27.2	21.5	10.6	2.1
La Grande	6.3	21.5	12.3	23.9	21.5	11.7	2.9
Lafayette	10.3	24.7	6.5	33.4	17.2	6.8	1.0
Lake Oswego	4.9	21.8	4.2	26.8	31.1	10.0	1.4
Lakeside	3.2	12.9	2.8	17.9	33.2	27.9	2.2
Lakeview	4.8	22.2	3.5	24.1	25.9	16.2	3.3
Lebanon	7.9	21.6	6.0	26.9	19.8	14.8	3.0
Lexington	4.9	22.8	3.4	28.1	24.7	15.9	-
Lincoln City	5.9	18.9	5.8	23.9	26.2	16.4	3.0
Lonerock	-	16.7	-	16.6	33.4	25.0	8.3
Long Creek	4.4	25.4	1.3	28.5	24.1	13.6	2.6
Lostine	6.8	23.9	6.1	23.2	26.2	13.7	-
Lowell	6.2	25.2	7.0	29.6	23.8	7.3	0.8
Lyons	6.9	21.3	5.2	25.3	28.5	11.7	1.1
Madras	10.3	25.7	7.7	29.8	16.1	8.6	1.9

2000 Oregon Population by Age Group Category							
Community	Under 5 years (%)	15-19 years (%)	20-24 years (%)	25-44 years (%)	45-64 years (%)	65-84 years (%)	85 years or more (%)
Malin	8.9	30.5	6.7	27.5	16.4	9.3	0.6
Manzanita	2.0	10.3	2.8	14.4	35.9	29.5	5.1
Maupin	5.4	20.7	3.4	22.8	31.1	15.8	0.7
Maywood Park	4.6	18.5	3.2	25.8	32.8	13.2	1.8
McMinnville	7.6	23.3	10.0	26.9	18.0	12.1	2.2
Medford	7.0	21.2	6.3	27.3	21.8	13.9	2.7
Merrill	7.8	22.6	6.1	29.2	18.4	14.1	1.7
Metolius	10.4	26.8	4.7	31.5	15.4	10.0	1.1
Mill City	7.2	25.7	4.8	26.7	22.2	12.1	1.3
Millersburg	5.2	21.1	4.0	29.4	29.1	10.7	0.5
Milton-Freewater	9.1	24.8	6.6	26.3	18.3	12.1	2.8
Milwaukie	6.4	19.0	5.6	31.2	24.1	11.7	2.0
Mitchell	5.9	24.1	1.8	19.4	28.3	17.1	3.5
Molalla	10.1	24.4	7.0	32.4	15.7	8.5	2.0
Monmouth	6.0	25.8	23.6	21.2	14.4	7.8	1.1
Monroe	6.8	24.8	7.4	29.5	23.2	7.6	0.8
Monument	7.3	19.9	5.3	27.2	23.8	15.9	0.7
Moro	5.3	29.4	2.7	22.2	23.1	16.0	1.2
Mosier	7.3	20.0	4.9	32.0	22.2	12.9	0.7
Mt. Angel	7.1	25.9	5.8	25.1	18.0	12.6	5.5
Mt. Vernon	7.4	22.6	5.0	26.9	24.6	12.8	0.8
Myrtle Creek	7.2	24.1	5.9	25.6	22.3	13.3	1.5
Myrtle Point	6.2	22.2	4.5	23.4	23.9	16.6	3.2
Nehalem	4.9	22.2	2.5	24.1	24.1	18.7	3.4
Newberg	8.0	24.3	10.4	29.8	17.0	8.5	2.1
Newport	5.6	19.2	5.6	25.7	26.7	15.5	1.8
North Bend	5.5	21.8	5.1	25.8	24.5	14.2	3.0
North Plains	9.6	22.4	3.7	34.9	18.8	9.1	1.6
North Powder	4.5	27.4	3.5	26.0	22.3	13.1	3.3
Nyssa	9.8	29.2	6.2	25.8	17.2	10.3	1.5
Oakland	5.5	24.3	4.7	24.5	26.0	14.0	1.0
Oakridge	4.6	21.3	3.4	23.6	26.8	18.4	1.7
Ontario	9.5	24.7	7.7	24.0	18.6	12.7	2.7
Oregon City	8.4	21.4	7.4	32.6	20.4	8.1	1.7
Paisley	6.1	14.9	0.8	20.3	34.1	21.8	2.0
Pendleton	6.5	20.1	7.8	31.3	21.7	10.9	1.7
Philomath	7.5	28.9	5.0	32.0	19.6	6.3	0.5
Phoenix	6.3	19.0	5.4	24.8	23.5	19.0	2.2
Pilot Rock	5.9	24.3	4.6	28.6	21.6	13.6	1.2
Port Orford	3.6	16.6	2.0	19.7	30.8	24.4	2.9
Portland	6.1	17.7	7.6	34.7	22.4	9.8	1.7
Powers	5.2	20.7	3.5	21.3	27.6	18.5	3.3

2000 Oregon Population by Age Group Category							
Community	Under 5 years (%)	15-19 years (%)	20-24 years (%)	25-44 years (%)	45-64 years (%)	65-84 years (%)	85 years or more (%)
Prairie City	5.9	21.7	2.6	24.2	25.3	15.1	5.1
Prescott	4.2	24.9	1.4	22.2	20.9	20.8	5.6
Prineville	8.3	23.7	6.9	27.0	18.6	13.3	2.2
Rainier	7.0	21.8	6.3	25.8	26.1	11.6	1.4
Redmond	8.4	23.5	6.3	30.6	18.3	11.1	1.8
Reedsport	4.8	18.2	3.9	19.9	26.9	23.4	2.8
Richland	1.4	8.2	-	8.8	35.4	42.2	4.1
Riddle	8.7	25.0	6.9	25.7	21.7	10.6	1.3
Rivergrove	6.2	22.8	2.8	28.7	32.5	5.5	1.5
Rockaway Beach	2.8	12.5	2.6	20.2	31.3	28.8	1.8
Rogue River	5.5	16.5	4.1	19.0	21.3	28.7	4.9
Roseburg	6.2	20.0	6.0	26.5	22.4	15.8	3.1
Rufus	4.1	13.5	4.9	19.8	31.4	23.9	2.6
Salem	7.4	21.2	8.2	30.1	20.5	10.4	2.1
Sandy	8.2	25.9	5.1	31.3	20.8	7.6	1.1
Scappoose	7.5	23.2	4.8	31.0	22.5	9.9	1.5
Scio	8.2	22.9	6.5	24.6	22.6	12.1	3.2
Scotts Mills	4.8	26.9	5.1	30.8	19.5	11.9	1.0
Seaside	5.5	18.3	6.0	26.0	25.0	15.5	3.6
Seneca	7.2	20.1	3.6	25.1	31.4	11.2	1.3
Shady Cove	5.9	17.7	3.9	22.3	27.9	21.1	1.2
Shaniko	-	7.7	7.7	26.8	42.3	15.4	-
Sheridan	8.2	25.9	5.8	28.6	19.5	10.1	1.9
Sherwood	11.5	21.7	4.0	41.1	16.5	4.8	0.5
Siletz	7.7	23.9	4.8	28.9	22.6	11.0	1.1
Silverton	8.3	26.4	6.2	25.6	20.3	11.1	2.3
Sisters	5.2	23.6	6.3	26.1	25.1	12.3	1.6
Sodaville	4.8	26.9	3.4	28.2	24.4	11.1	1.0
Spray	2.1	17.9	2.1	17.8	27.1	30.0	2.9
Springfield	8.2	22.0	8.3	31.4	20.0	8.8	1.5
St. Helens	8.6	24.1	6.5	31.7	19.6	8.3	1.3
St. Paul	7.6	25.7	5.1	25.4	22.0	13.0	1.1
Stanfield	9.8	25.7	7.2	28.2	20.0	8.3	0.7
Stayton	8.9	25.1	6.8	27.7	19.2	10.7	1.5
Sublimity	4.7	21.5	3.5	22.2	18.8	20.6	8.8
Summerville	6.0	23.9	0.9	21.4	32.5	14.6	0.9
Sumpter	2.3	6.4	2.3	17.0	48.0	21.6	2.3
Sutherlin	6.5	20.5	4.8	24.9	22.1	19.1	2.3
Sweet Home	7.3	23.2	5.3	25.3	21.7	14.9	2.3
Talent	7.5	21.1	8.6	27.3	18.5	14.3	2.7
Tangent	7.0	22.9	4.0	32.7	22.8	9.9	0.9
The Dalles	6.7	20.6	5.5	25.7	23.5	15.1	2.9

2000 Oregon Population by Age Group Category							
Community	Under 5 years (%)	15-19 years (%)	20-24 years (%)	25-44 years (%)	45-64 years (%)	65-84 years (%)	85 years or more (%)
Tigard	7.7	20.1	6.7	34.0	21.4	8.7	1.4
Tillamook	7.7	24.1	6.9	28.1	19.7	11.6	2.1
Toledo	7.5	24.3	4.7	32.0	20.8	9.6	1.0
Troutdale	8.6	24.5	6.0	35.4	21.1	4.0	0.4
Tualatin	7.6	23.2	6.9	35.5	21.0	4.8	1.0
Turner	5.8	20.5	4.8	24.2	22.4	18.5	3.6
Ukiah	7.8	23.5	2.4	27.5	25.5	11.7	1.6
Umatilla	10.3	24.1	8.8	34.7	16.5	5.3	0.5
Union	6.2	22.0	3.8	24.5	25.4	15.7	2.5
Unity	4.6	26.0	9.2	24.5	26.6	9.1	-
Vale	8.1	26.2	6.6	26.7	18.1	12.0	2.2
Veneta	7.1	28.9	4.8	30.5	21.3	6.6	0.9
Vernonia	8.3	27.6	4.5	30.8	18.9	9.1	0.8
Waldport	5.3	19.9	2.9	22.8	25.7	21.2	2.2
Wallowa	7.0	24.0	3.0	23.1	23.9	16.9	2.0
Warrenton	7.4	21.7	5.7	29.7	22.4	11.8	1.3
Wasco	4.2	19.9	3.1	22.0	28.3	19.1	3.1
Waterloo	8.8	22.2	5.9	25.5	24.7	10.8	2.1
West Linn	6.6	24.7	3.9	28.7	28.5	7.0	0.7
Westfir	5.1	27.2	2.5	27.5	24.3	12.3	1.1
Weston	4.7	25.8	4.5	27.0	24.9	11.7	1.3
Wheeler	2.8	12.0	5.9	19.9	31.7	19.2	8.4
Willamina	8.1	27.5	6.0	28.3	19.9	9.3	1.1
Wilsonville	7.6	19.1	7.3	31.5	20.1	12.3	2.1
Winston	8.5	23.5	6.7	26.7	20.5	12.7	1.6
Wood Village	9.1	21.5	8.3	32.8	19.6	7.6	1.0
Woodburn	8.9	24.7	8.1	25.4	14.6	14.9	3.2
Yachats	1.6	11.3	2.6	13.0	39.3	29.8	2.3
Yamhill	6.4	28.9	7.1	27.6	22.8	5.9	1.3
Yoncalla	6.7	22.6	4.9	25.9	23.6	14.9	1.3

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000

Oregon Race Data

2000 Oregon Race Data										
Geographic Area	Total Population	Total	White	Black or African/American	American Indian and Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races	Hispanic or Latino (of any race)
County										
Baker County	16,741	16,464	16,018	39	182	64	7	154	277	392
Benton County	78,153	76,152	69,678	658	619	3,506	188	1,503	2,001	3,645
Clackamas County	338,391	330,061	308,852	2,233	2,416	8,292	569	7,699	8,330	16,744
Clatsop County	35,630	34,812	33,185	185	367	430	60	585	818	1,597
Columbia County	43,560	42,457	41,130	105	580	255	43	344	1,103	1,093
Coos County	62,779	60,788	57,740	194	1,515	568	107	664	1,991	2,133
Crook County	19,182	18,907	17,830	8	250	82	6	731	275	1,082
Curry County	21,137	20,523	19,634	32	452	147	24	234	614	761
Deschutes County	115,367	113,109	109,423	222	956	849	85	1,574	2,258	4,304
Douglas County	100,399	97,687	94,234	177	1,530	628	93	1,025	2,712	3,283
Gilliam County	1,915	1,897	1,853	3	16	3	0	22	18	35
Grant County	7,935	7,800	7,593	8	127	15	3	54	135	163
Harney County	7,609	7,450	6,995	10	302	39	5	99	159	316
Hood River County	20,411	19,908	16,099	117	229	301	25	3,137	503	5,107
Jackson County	181,269	176,000	166,125	724	1,980	1,631	322	5,218	5,269	12,126
Jefferson County	19,009	18,395	13,113	50	2,981	57	42	2,152	614	3,372
Josephine County	75,726	73,696	71,103	202	949	476	83	883	2,030	3,229
Klamath County	63,775	61,562	55,695	404	2,672	512	79	2,200	2,213	4,961
Lake County	7,422	7,238	6,752	10	176	53	10	237	184	404
Lane County	322,959	312,237	292,728	2,506	3,642	6,470	599	6,292	10,722	14,874
Lincoln County	44,479	43,041	40,292	132	1,397	413	70	737	1,438	2,119
Linn County	103,069	100,504	96,059	327	1,313	799	151	1,855	2,565	4,514
Malheur County	31,615	30,807	23,959	387	322	619	24	5,496	808	8,099
Marion County	284,834	275,286	232,469	2,539	4,111	4,997	1,022	30,148	9,548	48,714

Oregon Race Data										
County	Total Population	Total	White	Black or African/American	American Indian And Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races	Hispanic Or Latino (of any race)
Morrow County	10,995	10,760	8,386	15	156	46	9	2,148	235	2,686
Multnomah County	660,486	633,622	522,825	37,434	6,785	37,638	2,320	26,620	26,864	49,607
Polk County	62,380	60,681	55,639	263	1,151	683	153	2,792	1,699	5,480
Sherman County	1,934	1,904	1,810	4	27	9	0	54	30	94
Tillamook County	24,262	23,781	22,772	54	289	157	50	459	481	1,244
Umatilla County	70,548	68,992	57,852	582	2,375	530	124	7,529	1,556	11,366
Union County	24,530	24,120	23,129	124	208	209	151	299	410	600
Wallowa County	7,226	7,115	6,973	2	51	17	3	69	111	125
Wasco County	23,791	23,230	20,599	71	906	191	119	1,344	561	2,214
Washington County	445,342	431,216	366,007	5,119	2,913	29,752	1,325	26,100	14,126	49,735
Wheeler County	1,547	1,517	1,444	1	13	4	1	54	30	79
Yamhill County	84,992	82,935	75,628	721	1,253	908	104	4,321	2,057	9,017

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000, Redistricting Data

Oregon Race Data

Community	Total Population	Total	White	Black or African/American	American Indian And Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races	Hispanic Or Latino (of any race)
Adair Village	536	509	471	4	13	7	8	6	27	24
Adams	297	294	285	0	6	2	0	1	3	1
Adrian	147	142	125	0	1	0	0	16	5	22
Albany	40,852	39,805	37,453	217	500	465	86	1,084	1,047	2,489
Amity	1,478	1,449	1,341	2	21	10	1	74	29	170
Antelope	59	59	55	0	4	0	0	0	0	2
Arlington	524	518	500	0	9	0	0	9	6	17
Ashland	19,522	18,914	17,873	118	199	365	26	333	608	695
Astoria	9,813	9,572	8,938	51	112	190	19	262	241	587
Athena	1,221	1,193	1,101	0	45	2	1	44	28	63
Aumsville	3,003	2,870	2,605	9	55	14	5	182	133	342
Aurora	655	644	617	3	4	7	0	13	11	41
Baker City	9,860	9,683	9,381	30	108	55	6	103	177	250
Bandon	2,833	2,729	2,620	7	55	17	3	27	104	78
Banks	1,286	1,246	1,172	5	4	23	6	36	40	49
Barlow	140	133	127	0	0	1	0	5	7	13
Bay City	1,149	1,122	1,077	5	20	8	2	10	27	36
Beaverton	76,129	73,278	59,615	1,324	507	7,349	272	4,211	2,851	8,463
Bend	52,029	50,927	48,897	145	412	521	42	910	1,102	2,396
Boardman	2,855	2,772	1,577	11	55	20	3	1,106	83	1,431
Bonanza	415	388	355	2	4	1	3	23	27	54
Brookings	5,447	5,229	4,932	11	131	70	7	78	218	258
Brownsville	1,449	1,396	1,357	5	24	2	0	8	53	30
Burns	3,064	3,001	2,866	6	76	16	3	34	63	162
Butte Falls	439	429	412	0	12	1	0	4	10	11
Canby	12,790	12,568	11,309	60	98	128	17	956	222	1,985
Cannon Beach	1,588	1,544	1,470	3	14	5	0	52	44	167

Oregon Race Data

Community	Total Population	Total	White	Black or African/American	American Indian And Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races	Hispanic Or Latino (of any race)
Canyon City	669	640	606	1	19	0	0	14	29	31
Canyonville	1,293	1,255	1,188	2	44	11	3	7	38	41
Carlton	1,514	1,470	1,390	2	24	4	1	49	44	70
Cascade Locks	1,115	1,079	994	1	47	8	0	29	36	80
Cave Junction	1,363	1,320	1,258	4	28	9	5	16	43	75
Central Point	12,493	12,157	11,743	31	110	91	24	158	336	527
Chiloquin	716	684	305	0	369	1	0	9	32	38
City of The Dalles	12,156	11,838	10,677	48	146	117	93	757	318	1,276
Clatskanie	1,528	1,485	1,435	1	19	10	4	16	43	51
Coburg	969	946	898	1	19	11	3	14	23	29
Columbia City	1,571	1,548	1,502	6	21	11	0	8	23	32
Condon	759	752	740	3	6	2	0	1	7	4
Coos Bay	15,374	14,834	13,952	57	349	221	48	207	540	691
Coquille	4,184	4,059	3,876	21	74	15	6	67	125	171
Cornelius	9,652	9,289	6,622	73	120	100	27	2,347	363	3,609
Corvallis	49,322	47,932	42,433	570	376	3,168	141	1,244	1,390	2,820
Cottage Grove	8,445	8,172	7,840	13	102	78	8	131	273	417
Cove	594	590	567	1	8	1	2	11	4	13
Creswell	3,579	3,433	3,186	11	65	19	6	146	146	251
Culver	802	751	601	2	12	1	0	135	51	226
Dallas	12,459	12,120	11,621	22	222	69	13	173	339	500
Dayton	2,119	2,029	1,710	33	25	11	0	250	90	555
Dayville	138	137	133	0	3	1	0	0	1	0
Depoe Bay	1,174	1,131	1,086	4	20	7	2	12	43	42
Detroit	262	257	253	0	3	0	0	1	5	10
Donald	608	597	542	1	9	2	1	42	11	68
Drain	1,021	977	925	1	27	5	3	16	44	34

Oregon Race Data

Community	Total Population	Total	White	Black or African/American	American Indian And Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races	Hispanic Or Latino (of any race)
Dufur	588	579	573	0	4	0	0	2	9	8
Dundee	2,598	2,543	2,409	0	22	26	0	86	55	196
Dunes City	1,241	1,230	1,204	1	17	6	1	1	11	15
Durham	1,382	1,327	1,234	11	10	23	5	44	55	108
Eagle Point	4,797	4,651	4,469	18	83	19	9	53	146	169
Echo	650	632	581	1	3	2	0	45	18	53
Elgin	1,654	1,644	1,607	1	12	1	6	17	10	22
Elkton	147	141	139	0	0	0	0	2	6	6
Enterprise	1,895	1,873	1,828	1	18	6	0	20	22	31
Estacada	2,371	2,328	2,012	4	34	42	1	235	43	303
Eugene	137,893	132,769	121,546	1,729	1,281	4,916	294	3,003	5,124	6,843
Fairview	7,561	7,138	5,762	230	63	260	28	795	423	1,210
Falls City	966	935	897	9	16	1	2	10	31	35
Florence	7,263	7,142	6,964	20	67	40	10	41	121	172
Forest Grove	17,708	17,093	14,425	77	158	374	42	2,017	615	3,065
Fossil	469	460	442	0	6	1	1	10	9	17
Garibaldi	899	877	852	0	16	6	1	2	22	12
Gaston	600	578	530	0	5	1	0	42	22	87
Gates	471	446	412	0	14	1	0	19	25	30
Gearhart	995	985	979	0	3	3	0	0	10	5
Gervais	2,009	1,918	810	7	31	6	1	1,063	91	1,310
Gladstone	11,438	11,116	10,342	82	70	241	33	348	322	700
Glendale	855	823	768	0	25	9	1	20	32	73
Gold Beach	1,897	1,853	1,766	5	42	17	1	22	44	51
Gold Hill	1,073	1,058	1,031	1	21	1	1	3	15	36
Granite	24	24	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Grants Pass	23,003	22,341	21,386	76	251	226	27	375	662	1,236

Oregon Race Data

Community	Total Population	Total	White	Black or African/American	American Indian And Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races	Hispanic Or Latino (of any race)
Grass Valley	171	169	163	0	4	2	0	0	2	6
Greenhorn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gresham	90,205	86,759	74,619	1,707	848	3,007	243	6,335	3,446	10,732
Haines	426	417	408	0	7	2	0	0	9	7
Halfway	337	332	321	0	10	0	0	1	5	7
Halsey	724	706	661	1	8	1	0	35	18	40
Happy Valley	4,519	4,424	3,949	35	13	400	7	20	95	85
Harbeck-Fruitdale	3,780	3,707	3,544	9	48	23	1	82	73	250
Harrisburg	2,795	2,732	2,599	3	34	16	0	80	63	159
Helix	183	178	173	0	4	0	0	1	5	5
Heppner	1,395	1,390	1,349	0	14	6	0	21	5	22
Hermiston	13,154	12,818	10,382	122	119	208	5	1,982	336	3,168
Hillsboro	70,186	67,873	54,391	858	577	4,585	177	7,285	2,313	13,262
Hines	1,623	1,590	1,532	2	44	9	1	2	33	27
Hood River	5,831	5,676	4,713	35	58	67	11	792	155	1,351
Hubbard	2,483	2,417	1,710	8	48	12	3	636	66	811
Huntington	515	510	503	2	5	0	0	0	5	11
Idanha	232	229	215	1	0	0	0	13	3	14
Imbler	284	283	277	0	0	1	1	4	1	4
Independence	6,035	5,804	4,447	25	90	35	22	1,185	231	1,818
Ione	321	314	314	0	0	0	0	0	7	10
Irrigon	1,702	1,660	1,241	3	19	7	0	390	42	464
Island City	916	907	874	2	11	7	3	10	9	19
Jacksonville	2,235	2,188	2,148	7	16	8	0	9	47	55
Jefferson	2,487	2,401	2,035	9	47	19	1	290	86	514
John Day	1,821	1,806	1,765	0	21	7	3	10	15	44
Johnson City	634	621	594	7	7	3	0	10	13	24

Oregon Race Data										
Geographic Area	Total Population	Total	White	Black or African/American	American Indian And Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races	Hispanic Or Latino (of any race)
Jordan Valley	239	230	224	0	0	1	1	4	9	5
Joseph	1,054	1,023	1,000	0	5	2	1	15	31	13
Junction City	4,721	4,581	4,306	14	58	28	2	173	140	391
Keizer	32,203	31,096	27,539	242	444	480	66	2,325	1,107	3,950
King City	1,949	1,939	1,916	0	3	18	0	2	10	10
Klamath Falls	19,462	18,717	16,566	198	864	256	26	807	745	1,814
Lafayette	2,586	2,512	2,221	11	42	16	6	216	74	523
La Grande	12,327	12,072	11,454	84	96	155	111	172	255	342
Lake Oswego	35,278	34,408	32,149	226	113	1,612	58	250	870	820
Lakeside	1,371	1,331	1,285	2	24	6	1	13	40	35
Lakeview	2,474	2,428	2,263	1	61	23	4	76	46	145
Lebanon	12,950	12,643	12,170	22	133	124	11	183	307	478
Lexington	263	261	255	0	3	2	0	1	2	1
Lincoln City	7,437	7,166	6,574	34	232	76	26	224	271	611
Lonerock	24	24	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Long Creek	228	221	219	0	2	0	0	0	7	1
Lostine	263	262	260	0	0	1	0	1	1	10
Lowell	857	819	787	0	17	2	2	11	38	39
Lyons	1,008	968	938	0	18	2	2	8	40	17
McMinnville	26,499	25,741	22,892	179	368	331	47	1,924	758	3,879
Madras	5,078	4,862	3,227	30	312	28	18	1,247	216	1,815
Malin	638	624	404	4	14	0	4	198	14	345
Manzanita	564	552	544	0	3	0	0	5	12	9
Maupin	411	399	365	0	14	12	0	8	12	20
Maywood Park	777	745	687	16	7	31	1	3	32	18
Medford	63,154	61,149	56,834	313	677	720	163	2,442	2,005	5,841
Merrill	897	840	656	1	9	2	0	172	57	300

Metolius	635	592	490	1	13	4	0	84	43	144
Mill City	1,537	1,485	1,326	4	36	13	3	103	52	175
Millersburg	651	640	628	0	5	6	0	1	11	18
Milton-Freewater	6,470	6,285	4,758	28	46	29	76	1,348	185	2,055
Milwaukie	20,490	19,887	18,637	194	193	484	52	327	603	813
Mitchell	170	161	153	0	4	2	0	2	9	13
Molalla	5,647	5,523	5,003	25	73	28	16	378	124	596
Monmouth	7,741	7,480	6,632	71	81	158	57	481	261	753
Monroe	607	599	587	2	6	2	2	0	8	61

Oregon Race Data

Geographic Area	Total Population	Total	White	Black or African/American	American Indian And Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races	Hispanic Or Latino (of any race)
Monument	151	150	144	0	6	0	0	0	1	0
Moro	337	332	312	4	4	1	0	11	5	18
Mosier	410	398	351	2	6	0	4	35	12	58
Mount Angel	3,121	2,970	2,361	14	29	6	3	557	151	869
Mount Hood Village	3,306	3,233	3,054	11	55	16	1	96	73	210
Mount Vernon	595	573	561	1	11	0	0	0	22	13
Myrtle Creek	3,419	3,326	3,195	5	73	30	0	23	93	105
Myrtle Point	2,451	2,376	2,277	7	68	3	1	20	75	87
Nehalem	203	199	199	0	0	0	0	0	4	3
Newberg	18,064	17,659	16,347	64	115	188	31	914	405	1,901
Newport	9,532	9,242	8,442	43	205	164	20	368	290	854
North Bend	9,544	9,289	8,827	36	171	125	32	98	255	354
North Plains	1,605	1,562	1,457	2	27	30	2	44	43	114
North Powder	489	480	471	3	3	2	1	0	9	15
Nyssa	3,163	3,069	1,787	13	25	32	3	1,209	94	1,809
Oakland	954	920	895	2	19	1	2	1	34	32
Oakridge	3,148	3,043	2,914	10	50	8	2	59	105	158
Ontario	10,985	10,613	7,609	60	97	295	16	2,536	372	3,521

Oregon Race Data										
Geographic Area	Total Population	Total	White	Black or African/American	American Indian And Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races	Hispanic Or Latino (of any race)
Oregon City	25,754	25,103	23,807	150	277	288	28	553	651	1,283
Paisley	247	247	242	0	2	1	0	2	0	3
Pendleton	16,354	16,008	14,580	250	412	154	10	602	346	981
Philomath	3,838	3,751	3,579	6	63	46	9	48	87	151
Phoenix	4,060	3,948	3,652	35	44	27	7	183	112	361
Pilot Rock	1,532	1,501	1,442	4	41	4	0	10	31	23
Portland	529,121	507,166	412,241	35,115	5,587	33,470	1,993	18,760	21,955	36,058
Port Orford	1,153	1,132	1,100	1	16	3	2	10	21	30
Powers	734	671	617	0	48	4	1	1	63	17
Prairie City	1,080	1,069	1,032	0	23	1	0	13	11	18
Prescott	72	70	69	0	1	0	0	0	2	0
Prineville	7,356	7,250	6,753	1	110	54	1	331	106	546
Rainier city	1,687	1,625	1,566	1	25	6	4	23	62	48
Redmond	13,481	13,200	12,634	12	157	87	22	288	281	739
Reedsport	4,378	4,281	4,112	1	54	19	1	94	97	205
Richland	147	145	143	0	1	1	0	0	2	1
Riddle	1,014	984	958	0	23	1	0	2	30	20
Rivergrove	324	317	304	0	0	8	0	5	7	9
Rockaway Beach	1,267	1,246	1,214	1	14	8	0	9	21	25
Rogue River	1,847	1,801	1,731	4	26	5	5	30	46	94
Roseburg	20,017	19,520	18,728	61	260	198	20	253	497	746
Rufus	268	264	244	0	9	1	0	10	4	18
St. Helens	10,019	9,707	9,292	34	168	63	15	135	312	406
St. Paul	354	345	277	1	2	1	0	64	9	91
Salem	136,924	132,327	113,746	1,750	2,064	3,304	643	10,820	4,597	19,973
Sandy	5,385	5,270	5,057	8	62	40	14	89	115	220
Scappoose	4,976	4,834	4,688	16	58	42	3	27	142	122

Oregon Race Data										
Geographic Area	Total Population	Total	White	Black or African/American	American Indian And Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races	Hispanic Or Latino (of any race)
Scio	695	679	648	0	27	3	0	1	16	13
Scotts Mills	312	295	293	0	0	0	0	2	17	11
Seaside	5,900	5,778	5,492	20	58	63	17	128	122	381
Seneca	223	222	221	0	0	1	0	0	1	2
Shady Cove	2,307	2,272	2,197	7	52	9	0	7	35	67
Shaniko	26	26	24	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sheridan	3,570	3,485	3,132	12	173	23	3	142	85	274
Sherwood	11,791	11,476	10,890	51	60	262	5	208	315	557
Siletz	1,133	1,064	807	5	238	8	1	5	69	21
Silverton	7,414	7,239	6,620	16	82	32	3	486	175	857
Sisters	959	951	919	0	15	4	0	13	8	44
Sodaville	290	285	267	2	4	6	2	4	5	12
Spray	140	138	137	0	0	1	0	0	2	0
Springfield	52,864	50,872	47,386	374	730	588	162	1,632	1,992	3,651
Stanfield	1,979	1,907	1,348	11	26	6	5	511	72	614
Stayton	6,816	6,619	6,199	9	102	42	5	262	197	626
Sublimity	2,148	2,121	2,093	2	10	6	5	5	27	35
Summerville	117	117	117	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Sumpter	171	167	165	0	2	0	0	0	4	1
Sutherlin	6,669	6,490	6,255	9	115	34	4	73	179	265
Sweet Home	8,016	7,800	7,506	20	133	49	12	80	216	248
Talent	5,589	5,436	4,879	30	59	20	6	442	153	693
Tangent	933	918	893	0	10	0	3	12	15	26
Tigard	41,223	39,986	35,195	468	253	2,298	220	1,552	1,237	3,686
Tillamook	4,352	4,275	4,028	7	53	31	7	149	77	484
Toledo	3,472	3,354	3,190	8	117	20	1	18	118	90
Troutdale	13,777	13,290	12,061	262	127	571	34	235	487	636

Oregon Race Data										
Geographic Area	Total Population	Total	White	Black or African/American	American Indian And Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races	Hispanic Or Latino (of any race)
Tualatin	22,791	22,151	19,803	181	157	824	84	1,102	640	2,701
Turner	1,199	1,173	1,125	1	20	3	0	24	26	52
Ukiah	255	253	243	0	0	7	0	3	2	4
Umatilla	4,978	4,882	3,589	134	67	19	3	1,070	96	1,622
Union	1,926	1,896	1,853	2	19	7	1	14	30	25
Unity	131	130	128	0	2	0	0	0	1	3
Vale	1,976	1,914	1,630	3	27	15	2	237	62	491
Veneta	2,755	2,649	2,560	7	38	18	1	25	106	115
Vernonia	2,228	2,185	2,125	4	31	11	2	12	43	50
Waldport	2,050	1,995	1,915	2	45	24	2	7	55	76
Wallowa	869	851	830	1	4	1	0	15	18	26
Warrenton	4,096	3,980	3,790	9	54	72	3	52	116	119
Wasco	381	370	359	0	9	1	0	1	11	13
Waterloo	239	238	233	1	3	1	0	0	1	5
Westfir	276	276	274	0	2	0	0	0	0	3
West Linn	22,261	21,803	20,775	120	78	647	18	165	458	638
Weston	717	700	598	0	24	0	0	78	17	113
Wheeler city	391	381	364	0	3	7	0	7	10	11
Willamina	1,844	1,775	1,553	3	181	3	1	34	69	63
Wilsonville	13,991	13,620	12,655	92	98	311	23	441	371	971
Winston	4,613	4,517	4,363	7	63	24	3	57	96	131
Woodburn	20,100	19,297	11,682	90	236	107	15	7,167	803	10,064
Wood Village	2,860	2,727	2,336	16	37	49	7	282	133	435
Yachats	617	602	594	1	2	5	0	0	15	17
Yamhill	794	782	766	0	2	11	0	3	12	38
Yoncalla	1,052	1,018	988	0	5	5	6	14	34	20

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000, Redistricting Data

Percentage Below Poverty Level in 1999						
	Families	Families with children under 18	Families with children under 5	Families with female householder, no husband present	Families with female householder, no husband present with children under 18	Families with female householder, no husband present with children under 5
State	7.9	12.4	16.6	25.9	33.3	47.4
County						
Baker	10.1	16.6	20.7	33.1	43.8	51.7
Benton	6.8	9.9	13.5	28.5	31.3	45.2
Clackamas	4.6	7.1	10.3	16.4	22.1	32.5
Clatsop	9.1	14.6	22.8	32.9	41.2	60.1
Columbia	6.7	10.4	14.6	30.1	39.1	59.8
Coos	11.1	17.8	24.1	30.4	38.7	52.3
Crook	8.1	14.4	19.7	27.9	36.6	59.4
Curry	9.7	13.6	14.0	32.2	40.9	54.1
Deschutes	6.3	9.3	11.5	23.9	28.8	42.9
Douglas	9.6	15.5	21.3	32.9	43.0	58.6
Gilliam	6.7	10.2	12.9	30.4	37.8	85.7
Grant	11.2	16.3	21.3	33.0	38.5	64.5
Harney	8.6	11.0	14.5	19.6	28.4	55.2
Hood River	9.8	14.1	21.5	27.5	32.4	60.2
Jackson	8.9	14.7	20.0	28.8	36.8	56.0
Jefferson	10.4	17.4	25.6	37.0	47.3	67.0
Josephine	11.3	19.7	27.1	36.0	15.4	69.9
Klamath	12.0	19.9	25.9	33.9	42.4	55.1
Lake	13.4	19.9	20.6	43.5	45.4	61.3
Lane	9.0	14.8	20.1	31.6	39.5	53.3
Lincoln	9.8	17.9	23.8	28.6	35.2	48.9
Linn	8.9	13.6	16.6	32.1	40.5	53.0
Malheur	14.6	22.1	29.4	39.4	52.7	68.7
Marion	9.6	15.1	21.0	29.2	37.4	50.6
Morrow	11.3	17.2	21.2	32.4	35.4	45.4
Multnomah	8.2	12.9	16.9	22.8	30.7	43.1
Polk	6.3	11.2	15.5	26.2	35.7	63.7
Sherman	12.3	17.6	18.5	32.4	51.1	60.0
Tillamook	8.1	14.1	20.9	23.4	30.5	49.1
Umatilla	9.8	14.1	18.9	32.3	38.7	51.6
Union	8.5	12.3	18.8	35.1	39.6	60.0
Wallowa	9.8	17.2	29.0	38.0	44.0	63.3
Wasco	10.3	15.9	19.2	35.8	42.7	46.9
Washington	4.9	7.4	10.2	15.8	20.9	31.7
Wheeler	12.7	22.7	28.8	34.4	39.3	81.1
Yamhill	6.0	8.9	11.4	25.1	30.7	47.1

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000

Percentage Below Poverty Level in 1999						
Municipality	Families	Families with children under 18	Families with children under 5	Families with female householder, no husband present	Families with female householder, no husband present with children under 18	Families with female householder, no husband present with children under 5
Adair Village	6.4	9.6	12.5	19.2	21.7	18.2
Adams	4.3	4.9	-	-	-	-
Adrian	17.8	12.5	-	50.0	50.0	-
Albany	9.3	14.3	17.6	32.0	39.5	54.1
Amity	8.7	11.6	8.7	31.3	39.2	35.3
Antelope	16.7	60.0	60.0	-	-	-
Arlington	7.9	12.0	33.3	58.8	66.7	100.0
Ashland	12.5	21.4	36.4	28.4	35.6	65.8
Astoria	11.6	17.9	30.7	40.7	48.4	61.5
Athena	10.5	13.5	15.3	34.4	34.8	12.5
Aumsville	13.8	18.4	23.7	40.8	46.2	66.0
Aurora	-	-	-	-	-	-
Baker City	10.7	17.1	20.1	32.0	41.5	50.5
Bandon	19.9	29.5	20.2	36.4	55.4	100.0
Banks	3.1	3.6	0.8	14.3	16.0	33.3
Barlow	5.4	8.0	-	100.0	100.0	-
Bay City	9.1	16.9	24.6	34.1	64.7	71.4
Beaverton	5.0	7.8	11.3	14.5	18.5	32.3
Bend	6.9	11.0	12.9	25.8	32.6	44.5
Boardman	16.3	21.7	25.1	38.3	40.2	45.0
Bonanza	14.7	17.5	6.7	60.0	77.8	66.7
Brookings	9.1	11.0	13.6	30.5	30.1	41.5
Brownsville	5.6	9.2	7.9	18.0	21.1	-
Burns	8.4	6.8	9.8	10.7	16.8	42.9
Butte Falls	15.1	18.2	27.6	31.0	31.0	45.5
Canby	6.0	8.6	13.4	12.8	17.4	29.7
Cannon Beach	8.2	17.1	20.3	18.4	25.0	8.3
Canyon City	5.7	10.5	16.7	26.3	31.3	66.7
Canyonville	15.8	17.5	14.5	41.4	51.3	43.8
Carlton	4.5	6.8	8.1	26.6	29.8	41.7
Cascade Locks	17.0	23.4	12.7	52.7	60.5	45.5
Cave Junction	23.6	32.6	45.1	47.2	52.5	72.0
Central Point	5.9	8.9	13.4	32.5	38.7	59.4
Chiloquin	33.5	42.6	50.0	57.4	73.6	70.6
Clatskanie	11.1	16.4	18.7	41.3	42.4	48.0
Coberg	7.7	6.3	13.7	25.8	15.0	33.3

Percentage Below Poverty Level in 1999						
Municipality	Families	Families with children under 18	Families with children under 5	Families with female householder, no husband present	Families with female householder, no husband present with children under 18	Families with female householder, no husband present with children under 5
Columbia City	2.8	3.4	-	6.5	10.5	-
Condon	3.6	4.8	-	16.0	22.2	-
Coos Bay	12.7	20.0	25.7	33.4	42.6	58.4
Coquille	7.6	13.0	18.9	26.0	32.0	51.9
Cornelius	10.8	15.2	18.9	35.9	36.7	26.3
Corvallis	9.7	13.8	17.5	33.6	34.8	47.5
Cottage Grove	15.6	25.7	33.8	43.3	49.1	71.7
Cove	11.1	14.1	18.8	41.7	47.6	60.0
Creswell	15.3	25.1	26.2	60.9	74.3	86.4
Culver	16.1	23.0	33.9	37.0	51.5	81.8
Dallas	7.8	13.8	14.2	30.2	39.4	62.5
Dayton	11.7	14.6	11.9	36.8	45.7	62.5
Dayville	12.2	22.7	-	-	-	-
Depot Bay	5.5	12.4	19.4	26.5	35.1	36.4
Detroit	17.9	35.3	26.1	53.3	66.7	75.0
Donald	6.3	8.2	20.0	32.0	34.8	100.0
Drain	8.6	11.6	17.5	28.9	34.4	100.0
Dufur	5.2	8.2	-	18.5	18.5	-
Dundee	5.7	8.5	12.8	24.4	27.8	58.6
Dunes City	8.5	15.8	8.0	44.1	52.0	33.3
Durham	10.2	13.2	19.8	25.8	30.4	51.9
Eagle Point	11.4	17.3	23.9	42.0	52.4	65.5
Echo	8.9	14.3	10.5	37.5	52.9	100.0
Elgin	8.8	18.6	19.0	31.6	24.1	41.7
Elkton	14.3	41.2	42.9	55.6	55.6	60.0
Enterprise	6.7	13.8	19.4	30.1	39.1	64.3
Estacada	10.1	13.4	12.7	27.6	32.1	22.6
Eugene	8.7	13.7	19.7	29.0	35.0	49.9
Fairview	13.5	22.3	24.4	39.9	46.0	46.5
Falls City	11.6	14.2	31.7	16.3	26.7	71.0
Florence	10.0	24.0	32.0	46.3	54.6	64.6
Forest Grove	10.4	14.0	17.2	24.4	32.2	44.8
Fossil	12.0	19.5	35.3	27.3	33.3	60.0
Garabaldi	6.9	13.6	-	34.5	47.1	-
Gaston	9.8	15.3	24.3	32.1	36.0	100.0
Gates	15.9	22.4	44.8	83.3	81.8	100.0
Gearhart	4.7	6.2	11.1	20.0	21.7	100.0
Gervais	13.3	15.7	16.9	19.0	32.0	-

Percentage Below Poverty Level in 1999						
Families with female householder, no husband present with children under 18	Families	Families with children under 18	Families with children under 5	Families with female householder, no husband present	Families with female householder, no husband present with children under 18	Families with female householder, no husband present with children under 5
Gladstone	6.6	11.0	18.7	17.9	29.0	35.3
Glendale	19.4	27.5	35.3	29.5	36.1	57.1
Gold Beach	8.8	15.5	16.4	26.4	29.5	30.0
Gold Hill	10.3	13.9	16.9	21.7	24.6	27.8
Granite	20.0	-	-	-	-	-
Grants Pass	12.2	19.4	25.9	33.9	41.7	69.6
Grass Valley	6.0	13.0	-	27.3	100.0	-
Greenhorn	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gresham	8.4	13.7	19.8	23.0	30.3	42.3
Haines	22.1	36.4	22.7	29.2	43.8	-
Halfway	24.5	37.0	47.1	59.1	65.0	80.0
Halsey	2.6	0.9	3.6	6.7	-	-
Happy Valley	0.6	1.1	-	14.8	28.1	-
Harrisburg	6.4	10.0	9.0	28.4	42.5	42.9
Helix	14.3	12.5	-	71.4	100.0	-
Heppner	11.1	16.4	21.4	38.3	39.0	42.9
Hermiston	11.9	17.5	22.8	39.8	43.6	50.7
Hillsboro	6.0	9.2	12.5	18.9	24.4	33.3
Hines	6.6	10.3	19.5	55.6	60.0	78.3
Hood River	12.1	19.7	28.2	35.9	42.4	84.4
Hubbard	11.0	16.2	18.9	22.7	28.9	16.2
Huntington	10.7	26.9	30.0	64.7	84.6	100.0
Idanha	12.5	15.6	28.6	62.5	100.0	100.0
Imbler	2.4	4.0	-	22.2	22.2	-
Independence	14.6	23.0	28.3	48.1	57.6	69.2
Ione	5.8	9.3	-	40.0	66.7	-
Irrigon	12.9	17.8	17.0	37.6	44.6	53.8
Island City	3.3	4.4	-	26.3	41.7	-
Jacksonville	5.3	6.1	5.2	18.7	18.9	-
Jefferson	12.2	18.1	18.7	31.4	39.6	55.3
John Day	13.0	16.7	22.3	39.1	39.7	75.0
Johnson City	6.1	8.6	8.6	10.3	13.3	-
Jordon Valley	13.5	17.1	-	23.1	27.3	-
Joseph	7.9	10.7	16.7	29.0	14.3	33.3
Junction City	6.3	10.4	10.5	20.7	26.0	20.0
Keizer	6.2	9.1	13.6	20.4	26.2	43.4
King Valley	-	-	-	-	-	-
Klamath Falls	16.2	24.7	33.4	41.4	47.6	59.1

Percentage Below Poverty Level in 1999						
Municipality	Families	Families with children under 18	Families with children under 5	Families with female householder, no husband present	Families with female householder, no husband present with children under 18	Families with female householder, no husband present with children under 5
La Grande	8.3	10.9	17.2	34.6	37.4	66.1
Layfayette	10.7	13.3	16.7	33.0	40.5	40.5
Lake Oswego	2.3	2.4	2.8	6.4	8.3	-
Lakeside	11.6	22.3	40.0	33.3	45.8	100.0
Lakeview	14.3	22.3	34.0	38.0	43.0	78.3
Lebanon	14.4	21.1	25.8	42.9	46.2	60.6
Lexington	6.7	14.7	-	-	-	-
Lincoln City	12.5	22.8	33.8	30.4	35.9	57.5
Lonerock	33.3	-	-	-	-	-
Long Creek	17.5	18.8	30.0	-	-	-
Lostine	7.0	13.2	-	62.5	62.5	-
Lowell	8.3	17.7	26.2	30.2	44.8	42.9
Lyons	9.3	11.5	12.0	41.9	68.4	66.7
Madras	15.2	20.9	26.6	46.2	63.9	76.0
Malin	19.4	29.9	48.7	18.2	28.6	-
Manzanita	4.9	18.8	33.3	15.0	25.0	100.0
Maupin	13.3	29.5	58.8	76.5	76.5	60.0
Maywood Park	-	-	-	-	-	-
McMinnville	8.2	12.7	17.1	28.5	34.9	48.4
Medford	10.3	17.1	25.5	33.5	41.7	63.9
Merrill	19.9	25.0	29.4	33.3	41.2	40.0
Metolius	14.0	16.8	21.1	48.1	52.4	75.0
Mill City	10.0	15.3	12.5	35.4	38.5	15.4
Millersburg	7.1	11.6	-	40.0	75.0	-
Milton-Freewater	13.2	16.8	25.2	38.9	41.8	74.1
Milwaukie	6.2	9.1	13.6	15.8	22.9	26.4
Mitchell	26.9	40.0	37.5	61.5	61.5	100.0
Molalla	7.3	10.9	10.3	31.3	38.2	48.0
Monmouth	7.1	12.9	18.5	21.2	28.1	61.1
Monroe	12.3	14.7	19.4	3.0	36.0	40.0
Monument	6.8	14.3	16.7	60.0	60.0	100.0
Moro	14.7	20.8	40.0	42.1	53.3	100.0
Mosier	1.7	-	-	-	-	-
Mt. Angel	10.3	15.4	24.1	25.5	32.9	39.4
Mt. Vernon	13.7	21.6	27.3	37.5	56.0	69.2
Myrtle Creek	14.4	21.4	32.6	44.8	54.2	72.6
Myrtle Point	15.0	28.0	46.1	28.9	42.3	41.2
Nehalem	9.0	8.8	-	-	-	-

Percentage Below Poverty Level in 1999						
Municipality	Families	Families with children under 18	Families with children under 5	Families with female householder, no husband present	Families with female householder, no husband present with children under 18	Families with female householder, no husband present with children under 5
Newberg	4.3	5.8	6.6	17.7	20.2	37.2
Newport	12.2	19.8	24.8	26.7	30.2	37.3
North Bend	11.8	17.4	28.1	35.1	40.2	60.9
North Plains	4.8	5.1	-	14.9	20.6	-
North Powder	22.1	34.4	61.9	36.8	35.7	100.0
Nyssa	19.9	26.7	34.8	33.9	50.4	64.6
Oakland	10.1	18.0	20.0	44.4	59.3	100.0
Oakridge	12.2	18.6	11.0	39.5	58.2	24.0
Ontario	16.4	24.3	29.5	43.9	58.2	70.0
Oregon City	6.5	10.1	11.7	24.9	32.5	41.4
Paisley	16.9	14.9	8.1	25.0	34.6	26.2
Pendleton	8.7	14.0	19.6	27.0	32.3	49.2
Pilomath	6.5	9.0	13.1	31.9	34.4	58.7
Phoenix	8.6	20.1	13.9	32.9	58.4	46.3
Pilot Rock	6.4	10.5	6.7	26.2	40.7	33.3
Port Orford	16.1	29.5	26.2	50.0	72.7	68.8
Portland	8.5	13.2	16.8	23.0	31.1	43.6
Powers	16.3	34.2	27.3	42.9	54.5	57.1
Prairie City	10.6	17.9	21.8	19.4	27.3	60.0
Prescott	13.0	27.3	-	-	-	-
Prineville	10.0	15.8	19.2	36.1	46.1	65.5
Rainier	8.4	14.3	23.7	43.6	60.0	95.0
Redmond	6.6	8.7	8.8	20.8	23.9	27.3
Reedsport	11.7	22.7	50.0	54.4	60.8	100.0
Richland	11.4	30.0	100.0	33.3	50.0	100.0
Riddle	16.1	22.8	27.3	48.8	54.3	50.0
Rivergrove	4.8	9.3	15.4	-	-	-
Rockaway Beach	7.0	13.3	21.9	37.8	50.0	83.3
Rogue River	9.9	14.6	18.8	29.2	36.8	36.4
Roseburg	11.0	18.4	23.3	35.5	43.9	61.0
Rufus	11.5	37.5	42.9	42.9	75.0	100.0
Salem	10.5	16.3	24.1	29.6	37.9	53.4
Sandy	3.8	6.0	4.0	22.8	25.9	18.2
Scappoose	4.5	8.3	9.3	24.5	32.0	100.0
Scio	7.7	12.8	19.6	25.9	36.8	50.0
Scotts Mills	9.0	12.2	13.6	16.7	25.0	-
Seaside	11.6	19.2	27.6	32.5	43.4	61.1
Seneca	24.0	17.9	36.8	41.7	41.7	62.5

Percentage Below Poverty Level in 1999						
Municipality	Families	Families with children under 18	Families with children under 5	Families with female householder, no husband present	Families with female householder, no husband present with children under 18	Families with female householder, no husband present with children under 5
Shady Cove	6.4	9.8	16.5	18.5	25.5	46.7
Shaniko	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sheridan	9.7	11.8	8.2	27.8	39.3	61.8
Sherwood	1.5	1.8	2.0	10.3	10.3	28.2
Siletz	11.0	17.6	25.3	53.7	66.7	85.7
Silverton	10.4	13.9	24.1	31.9	34.4	64.8
Sisters	7.4	4.7	-	-	-	-
Sodaville	7.7	8.0	-	28.6	28.6	-
Spray	11.4	33.3	100.0	-	-	-
Springville	14.8	22.2	28.8	40.0	49.5	66.1
St. Helens	8.7	12.4	19.8	35.9	44.6	66.3
St. Paul	3.8	8.0	16.7	28.6	36.4	100.0
Stanfield	10.6	13.8	17.3	23.2	32.6	44.4
Stayton	11.5	17.1	28.9	33.0	36.7	68.8
Sublimity	4.9	6.3	10.7	22.0	35.5	50.0
Summerville	16.1	16.7	-	-	-	-
Sumpter	6.5	14.3	50.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Sutherlin	12.4	16.7	16.3	30.4	34.8	21.1
Sweet Home	14.0	18.7	21.2	33.2	38.3	43.6
Talent	12.4	18.6	21.4	27.5	33.8	45.0
Tangent	5.2	7.6	14.9	-	-	-
The Dalles	9.0	13.6	17.3	31.4	34.8	38.0
Tigard	5.0	7.6	11.8	19.6	25.2	44.7
Tillamook	11.8	18.6	38.2	21.9	26.9	48.8
Toledo	18.6	28.9	32.0	44.5	59.4	68.0
Troutdale	3.3	4.4	5.7	12.8	15.9	26.4
Tualatin	3.0	4.0	6.6	9.9	14.4	28.4
Turner	4.8	7.6	15.7	31.7	29.6	60.0
Ukiah	10.7	9.1	16.7	100.0	100.0	100.0
Umatilla	15.6	21.2	26.8	41.4	49.4	69.0
Union	12.2	15.3	19.5	41.1	51.1	61.1
Unity	5.3	7.7	-	-	-	-
Vale	15.6	21.1	30.4	39.1	44.3	83.3
Veneta	11.4	19.4	9.0	64.9	62.9	40.0
Vernonia	8.6	10.7	14.6	42.7	44.4	70.6
Waldport	9.4	15.4	32.2	25.2	27.4	42.9
Wallowa	19.5	27.7	52.1	50.0	61.8	85.7
Warrenton	11.9	19.4	23.1	43.4	65.0	85.4

Percentage Below Poverty Level in 1999						
Municipality	Families	Families with children under 18	Families with children under 5	Families with female householder, no husband present	Families with female householder, no husband present with children under 18	Families with female householder, no husband present with children under 5
Wasco	7.0	12.0	16.7	-	-	-
Waterloo	10.9	10.5	-	40.0	100.0	-
West Linn	2.9	3.8	3.6	11.6	15.0	23.2
Westfir	8.9	10.6	6.3	66.7	50.0	-
Weston	10.0	13.1	20.8	22.7	27.8	-
Wheeler	10.9	21.7	53.8	20.0	25.0	-
Willamina	10.9	14.3	10.4	29.8	30.1	42.9
Wilsonville	3.0	4.0	7.7	11.6	13.5	30.7
Winston	13.7	19.8	28.7	37.7	45.8	46.7
Wood Village	6.9	11.4	26.0	6.0	13.0	-
Woodburn	11.5	18.3	16.9	27.5	36.0	27.8
Yachats	12.8	36.7	47.8	60.7	73.9	78.6
Yamhill	5.3	8.7	9.3	15.8	17.6	25.0
Yoncalla	13.3	21.0	23.5	35.1	43.3	38.5

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000

REFERENCES

- Bannon, J. J. (1976). *Leisure resources: Its comprehensive planning*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Crompton, J. L. (1983). *Needs assessment: Taking the pulse of the public recreation client*. College Station, TX: Texas Agricultural Extension Service.
- Espeseth, R. D. (1982). *Guidelines for selecting park and recreation consultants*. Urbana: Office of Recreation and Park Resources, University of Illinois. ORPR-26.
- Espeseth, R. D. (1977). *Site planning of park areas*. Urbana, IL: Office of Recreation and Park Resources. North Central Regional Extension Publication 290.
- Fogg, G. E. (1990). *Park planning guidelines* (3rd ed.). Arlington, VA: National Recreation and Park Association.
- Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Parks, Recreation and Historic Sites Division. (1992). *The Georgia recreation planning manual: A manual for Georgia communities*. Atlanta: Author.
- Gold, S.M. (1980). *Recreation and planning design*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Goltsman, S. M., Gilbert, T. A., & Wohlford, S. D. (1992). *The accessibility checklist* (2nd ed.). Berkeley, CA: MIG Communications.
- Hudson, S. (1988). *How to conduct community needs assessment surveys in public parks and recreation*. Columbus, OH: Publishing Horizons.
- Hunt, S. L. & Brooks; K. W. (1983). *A planning model for public recreation agencies*. Journal of Park and Recreation Administration. 4, 1-12.
- Illinois Department of Natural Resources. (1999). *Statewide outdoor recreation partnership plan*. Springfield, IL: Author.
- Illinois Department of Conservation, Division of Planning (1990). *Final report. Illinois recreational facilities inventory*. Urbana-Champaign, IL: University of Illinois.
- Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Outdoor Recreation. (1992). *Planning guidelines for parks and recreation*. Indianapolis: Author.
- Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Outdoor Recreation. (1990). *Small community park and recreation planning guide*. Indianapolis: Author.
- Lakner, E. (1992). *Illinois outdoor recreation activities*. Urbana: Survey Research Laboratory, University of Illinois.
- Lancaster, R. A. (Ed.) (1983). *Recreation, park and open space standards and guidelines*. Alexandria, VA: National Recreation and Park Association.
- Martin, G. A. & Espeseth, R. D. (1988). *Conservation easements and their use by governmental agencies*. Urbana: Office of Recreation and Park Resources, University of Illinois. ORPR 64.

Masek, M. (1976). *A recreation planning manual for the state of Missouri*. Columbia: University of Missouri. 903D.

McGovern, J. (1992). *The ADA self-evaluation: A handbook for compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act by parks and recreation agencies*. Arlington, VA: National Recreation and Parks Association.

Mills, A. S., Albrecht, D. E. & Wicks, B. E. (1984). *Recreation and parks needs assessment survey manual*. College Station, TX: Texas Agricultural Extension Service.

Moore, R. C., Goltsman, S. M., & Iacofano, D. S. (1987). *Play for all guidelines: Planning, design, and management of outdoor play settings for all children*. Berkeley: MIG Communications.

Nordhaus, R. S., Kantrowitz, M., & Wiembieda, W. J. (1984). *Accessible fishing: A planning handbook*. Albuquerque, NM: Richard S. Nordhaus.

Rivers, Trails and Conservation Assistance, National Park Service. (1991). *Economic impacts of protecting rivers, trails, and greenway corridors: A resource book* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Author.

United States Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board. (1992). *Americans with Disabilities Act. Accessibility guidelines for buildings and facilities, transportation facilities, transportation vehicles*. Washington, D. C.: Author.

United States Consumer Product Safety Commission. (1992). *Handbook for public playground safety*. Washington, D.C.: Author.

United States Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration, Bureau of the Census. (1992). 1990 *census of population: General population characteristics, Illinois*. Washington, D.C.: Author [See Table 1].

USDA Forest Service, Technology and Development Center. *Design guide for accessible outdoor recreation* (Interim Draft). San Dimas, CA: Author.